DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 616 CS 200 767

AUTHOR	Shuy, Roger W.; And Others
TITLE	Sociolinguistic Factors in Speech Identification.
INSTITUTION	Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	135p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Dialect Studies; *Employer Attitudes; Employment Potential; Language Patterns; Language Role; *Negro Dialects; Nonstandard Dialects; Pattern Recognition; Racial Factors; *Racial Recognition; Socioeconomic Influences; *Sociolinguistics
IDENTIFIERS	*Speech Identification

ABSTRACT

The first of two experiments conducted in Detroit investigated the relationship between class and ethnic membership and identification of class and ethnicity; the role age and sex of respondent play in accuracy of speaker identification; and attitudes toward various socioethnic speech patterns. The second study was concerned with the attitudes of employers and potential employees toward various speech patterns. The evidence from the first study made it clear that in Detroit, regardless of the age, race, sex or socioeconomic status of the listener, Negro identity of taped speakers could be made accurately from a minimum of 74.4% to a maximum of 86.2% of the time. It was also significant that lower socioeconomic status was more accurately identified. The use of the semantic differential scale was also noted to compensate for the general inarticulateness of the public in evaluating speech. The second study indicated that employers do judge potential employees on the basis of speech. As it relates to possible job opportunities, however, the employers consistently rated the speech as appropriate for lower level jobs than the actual employment level of the speaker. In addition, teenagers seemed to correlate the concept of "successful" and "acceptable" speech with opportunity. (HOD)

ED 083616

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

C.S

SOCIOLINGUISTIC FACTORS IN SPEECH IDENTIFICATION

Research Project No. MH 15048-01

Roger W. Shuy, Joan C. Baratz and Walter A. Wolfram

Center for Applied Linguistics
Washington, D.C.
1969

The research reported herein was supported by the Research Program of the National Institute of Mental Health.

CS 200 717

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Purpose	2
2.1 Study A: Detroit Language Attitude Study	2
2.2 Study B: Washington Employability Study	3
3. Study A: Detroit Language Attitude Study	3
3.1 Rationale	3
3.2 Research Questions	4
3.3 Procedures	5
3.3.1 Stimulus Tape	5
3.3.1.1 Selection of Informants	5
3.3.1.2 Selection of Passages	6
3.3.1.3 Tape Order	8
3.3.2 Questionnaire	10
3.3.2.1 Form A	10
3.3.2.2 Form B	14
3.3.3 Test Administration	14
3.3.3.1 Pre-testing	14
3.3.3.2 Selection of Respondents	16
3.3.3.3 Instructions	20
3.4 Results	22
3.4.1 The Identification of Race and of SES	23
3.4.1.1 Race Identification	23
3.4.1.2 SES Identification	27
3.4.1.3 Race and SES Identification	30
3.4.2 Semantic Differential Responses to Speech	35
3.4.3 Semantic Differential Responses to Speech Concepts	40
3.4.3.1 Effect of Race of Respondent to Speech Concepts	40
3.4.3.2 Effect of Sex of Respondent to Speech Concepts	42
3.4.3.3 Effect of Age of Respondent to Speech Concepts	44
3.4.3.4 Effect of SES of Respondent to Speech Concepts	46
4. Study B: Washington Employability Study	48
4.1 Rationale	48
4.2 Research Questions	48
4.3 Procedures	48
4.3.1 Stimulus Tape	48
4.3.1.1 Selection of Informants	49
4.3.1.2 Selection of Passages	49
4.3.1.3 Tape Order	50

Page

4.3.2 Questionnaires 51
4.3.3 Test Administration 53
4.3.3.1 Selection of Respondents 53
4.3.3.2 Instructions 54
4.4 Results 55
4.4.1 Ranking of Employability 56
4.4.2 The Correlation of Employability with "Successful" and "Acceptable" Speech 58

5. Conclusions 61
5.1 Discussion of Results 61
5.1.1 The Issue of Negro Speech 61
5.1.2 The Issue of Social Markedness 62
5.1.3 The Issue of Popular Judgments Regarding Dialects 64
5.1.4 The Issue of Using the Semantic Differential Scale 65
5.1.5 The Issue of Correlating Objective and Subjective Language Data 66
5.1.6 The Issue of Language and Employability 67
5.2 Limitations of this Study 68
5.2.1 Problems of SES Classification 68
5.2.2 Difficulties in Constructing the Semantic Differential 68
5.2.3 Statistical Procedures 68
5.3 Implications for Further Research 69
5.3.1 Examination of the Generalizability of this Research 69
5.3.2 Pedagogical Applications 69
5.3.3 Expansion of the Semantic Differential 69
5.3.4 Language Attitudes as Related to Prejudice ... 70

6. Appendices .....
6.1 Appendix A: A Review of the Literature on Linguistic Correlates of Social Stratification .....
6.2 Appendix B: Tape, Typescript, Phonemic Script and Statement of Diagnostic Features .....
6.3 Apendix C: Study A Questionnaire .....
6.4 Appendix D: Study B. Questionnaire .....

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Psycholinguistic Attitude Basic Tape Order	9
2.	Respondents to Tape	18
3.	Sources for Respondents	19
4.	Effect of Race of Respondent on Identification of Race of Speaker	24
5.	Effect of Age of Respondent on Identification of Race of Speaker	24
6.	Effect of SES of Respondent on Identification of Race of Speaker	25
7.	Effect of Sex of Respondent on Identification of Race of Speaker	26
8.	Effect of Age, Race and Sex on Identification of Race of Speaker	26
9.	Effect of Race of Respondent on Identification of SES of Speaker	28
10.	Effect of Age of the Respondent on Identification of SES of the Speaker	28
11.	Effect of SES of Respondent on Identification of SES of Speaker	29
12.	Effect of Sex of the Respondent on Identification of SES of the Speaker	30
13.	Correct Identification of Race and SES of Speakers	30
14.	Effect of Race of Respondent on Identification of Race and SES of Speaker	31
15.	Effect of Race and SES of Respondent on Identification of Race and SES of Speakers	32
16.	Effect of SES of Respondent on Identification of Race and SES	32
17.	Effect of Sex of Respondent on Identification of Race and SES	33
18.	Effect of Age, Race and Sex of Respondent on Identification of Race and SES	34
19.	Response Means to Semantic Differential	36
20.	Response Means to Semantic Differential; Graceful-Awkward	37
21.	Response Means to Semantic Differential; Informal-Formal Scale	38
22.	Response Means to Semantic Differential; Tense-Relaxed Scale	39
23.	Response Means to Semantic Differential; Thick-Thin Scale	39
24.	Response Means on Semantic Differential Responses: Race	41
25.	Response Means on Semantic Differential: Sex	43
26.	Response Means on Semantic Differential: Age	45
27.	Response Means on Semantic Differential: SES	47
28.	Study B Tape Order	50
29.	Employer's Ranking of the Teenage and Adult Speech Stimuli	56
30.	Comparison of Employers and Teenagers Ranking of Speech	58
31.	Teenagers Rating of Speech Re Success and Job Status	59
32.	Teenagers Rating of Speech Re Acceptability and Job Status	59
33.	Data Re Relationship of Successful Speech and Acceptable Speech	60

SOCIOLINGUISTICS FACTORS IN SPEECH IDENTIFICATION

1. Introduction

It is not uncommon for listeners to assign class status and ethnic identification of individuals on the basis of their spoken language (Putnam and O'Hern 1955; Lambert et al, 1960; Harms 1961; Berlin 1962; Nader 1962; Buck 1968). This is especially true in terms of identification of Negro and white speakers. Although we continually make assumptions about individuals from the manner in which they express themselves, there is very little systematic research concerning the psycho-social and linguistic variables which play a role for the listener in the identification process.

William Labov's pioneering efforts in the field provided a useful empirical model for further research (Labov 1967). Working with five phonological features, Labov found that the subjective reactions of his subjects were inarticulate and below the level of conscious awareness (Labov 1967: 405). He found that there is no vocabulary of socially meaningful terms with which the subjects could evaluate speech and that although New Yorkers often held strong views about the speech of their city, only a few could cite specific words, sounds or phrases which adequately characterized what they meant. Labov's exploratory work revealed that taped, natural utterances of native speakers were superior to synthetic representations made by experimenters.

It is not our purpose here to summarize the results of research in this area. What is of major concern is that research into subjective reaction revealed patterns quite similar to those yielded by

objective linguistic data. Labov's research clearly demonstrated, furthermore, that the forces which preserve the social significance of linguistic forms are related to the need for identification with specific sub-groups of society, that social isolation does not breed ignorance of the norms of the alien sub-groups, and that there is a relatively uniform set of norms at work in a socially complex linguistic community.

From this beginning, a number of research questions can be raised with respect to subjective reactions toward language. How accurately can people judge ethnicity from a sample of spoken language? Can individuals determine social class from such a sample? How do the sex and age of judges relate to their ability to make these judgments? Does the accurate identification of a speaker increase if the respondents possess similar attributes of the speakers? How much speech is enough in order for a respondent to make an accurate judgment about the social class of a speaker?

In addition to research questions involving judgments about language in relation to race and social class, this research also concerns the relationship of language to economics as revealed by employability.

2. Purpose

The purpose of the present research was twofold.

2.1 Study A. The first experiment was designed to investigate the relationship between class and ethnic membership and identification of class and ethnicity; to discern the role such factors as age and sex of respondent play in accuracy of speaker identification, and;

to assess the attitudes towards various socio-ethnic speech patterns.

2.2 Study B This research was concerned with the attitudes of employers and potential employees towards various speech patterns. We wished to determine whether speech variables were a significant factor in employability, and whether there was agreement between employers and employees as to what "adequate" speech patterns were for various forms of employment.

3. Study A

3.1 Rationale

Linguistic variables. There is wide variation, socially, ethnically, and regionally, in the manner in which speakers produce English. These variations may be phonological (pronunciation, e.g. cah/car), grammatical, (e.g. He didn't hit nobody/He didn't hit anybody) or lexical (e.g. skillet/frying pan). These phonological, grammatical, and lexical variations are not random but are distributed in systematic patterns within various sub-groups of native English speakers.

Recent investigations of language behavior of whites and Negroes have indicated distinct linguistic indices which correlate with social status and ethnicity. (Labov 1966; Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1967; Stewart 1965, 1967, 1968; Wolfram 1969). In addition, certain linguistic variables within social and ethnic groups have been shown to be associated with age or sex of the speakers (Stewart 1965; Wolfram 1969; Labov 1968; Shuy 1967).

Attitudinal variables. Studies by Lambert et al (1960, 1962, 1965) have shown that attitudes concerning the value of a particular language system are extremely important in determining how an individual responds to a speaker of that language. They have also demonstrated that age, sex and ethnicity play a role in regard to attitudes about a particular language or dialect.

The psychological literature is replete with studies concerning the relationship between social distance and social acceptability (See Brown 1965, Chapter III). This question, however, has not been investigated thoroughly in regard to language behavior and attitudes.

3.2 Research Questions

The research questions posed in this research were as follows:

1. Can individuals correctly identify the ethnicity of a person from a sample of his spoken language?
2. Can individuals correctly identify the social class of an individual from a sample of his spoken language?
3. Do women and men perform equally well on ethno-social identification of speakers?
4. Is there a difference between children, teen-agers and adults on their ability to identify ethno-social status?
5. Does accurate identification of a speaker increase if respondents possess similar attributes of the speakers - e.g. upper-middle class identifies upper-middle class speakers, Negro identifies Negro better than whites, etc. (or, the "it takes one to know one" thesis).
6. Can subjects make judgments on a semantic differential in response to speech samples?

7. Is there a difference in responses to white speech and Negro speech on the semantic differential?
8. Do responses on the semantic differential to various types of speech vary with age, sex and ethnicity of the speaker?
9. Do differing ethno-social groups respond differentially to the language concepts presented in this study?

3.3 Procedure

3.3.1 Stimulus Tape

The basic instrument used in this experiment was a tape recording of speech samples from informants representing different social classes and races.

3.3.1.1 Selection of Informants[1]

On the basis of this research the sample was set up to include a four-way class and two-way ethnic (i.e. eight "cells") distinction. The social classification of informants was based on an adaptation of the Hollingshead scale (1958) which was constructed for use by the Detroit Dialect Study (See Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1968 and Wolfram 1969).

The selection of informants was limited to adult males between the ages of 30-35. The limitation of informants in such a way placed one restriction on the construction of the tape. The original tapes used by the Detroit Dialect Study did not include any lower-working class white males; therefore, this cell was not represented on the tape, leaving

---

1 Informant is used in this report to refer to the individuals whose speech was the basis for the stimulus tape.

seven cells (four classes of Negro and three classes of white adult males). In each of these cells, speech passages from three different informants were chosen; thus, there were 21 different informants included in the tape.

The following criteria were employed in the selection of informants for the tape:

1) The informant should be a resident of Detroit for at least ten years and preferably a lifetime resident.

2) His speech should be evaluated as "representative" (in terms of particular linguistic features) of the social class and ethnic group to which he was assigned.

3.3.1.2 Selection of Passages

The speech passages chosen for the study were taken from the informal discourse section of the interview conducted by the Detroit Dialect Study. Although this particular method of test construction departs from traditional methods in which different speakers read identical passages, there is good reason for selecting informal speech samples. In the first place, it gives a degree of naturalness not found in the traditional technique. Furthermore, the variety of topics makes the task more interesting. Finally, this method allows for certain grammatical alternants which would not be realized if speakers from different classes were simply reading the same passage. The selection of passages of the tape was based on two main criteria: 1) linguistic features representing the particular social and ethnic group of the informant should be found in the passage (e.g. the absence of third singular -Z such as he go in the speech of working class Negroes) and 2) the passage should be as culturally "unmarked" as possible (e.g. no reference to socially

or ethnically characteristic behavior such as the eating of chittlings by Negroes or the reading of the Wall Street Journal by a middle class stock broker) since the respondents were to react solely on the basis of the linguistic variables. The evaluation of speech as "representative" of the informants' social and ethnic group was based on a comparison of the linguistic variables in the passage with objective studies of social stratification of Detroit speech (Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1967; Wolfram 1969; and Fasold 1968). A team of three linguists was ultimately responsible for designating the informants' speech as "typical" of the particular social and ethnic group they were chosen to represent. (For a description of the diagnostic linguistic features in the passages, See Appendix A).

In selecting passages which would be as comparable as possible in terms of their cultural content, two parts of the Detroit Dialect Study interview yielded the most useful passages, namely, the narration of movies and TV programs and the description of childhood games. Thus, the excerpting of passages concentrated on these two parts of the interview.

The passages were 20-30 seconds in length. Because of this limitation some editing of the passages was necessary. In addition to mere time limitation, editing was done in order to 1) eliminate parts of a passage where the recording quality was inadequate for playing to a group and 2) eliminate cultural content (including certain vocabulary items used by particular social classes or ethnic groups) which would allow for identification of informants on the basis of content rather than linquistic variables. The end result of this editing was 21 passages dealing with

movie or TV narratives and childhood game descriptions which were relatively comparable in terms of their cultural content. (Appendix A)

In addition to the 21 passages of 20-30 seconds in length, 9 isolated sentences were included on the tape for consideration in future research studies. Whereas each of the longer passages generally included a number of linguistic indices representative of a particular race and social class, in the short stimuli an attempt to isolate particular linguistic variables which were found in the longer passages was made. This was done in order to determine the relative effect of these features in influencing the respondents' reactions. Thus, for example, multiple negation (e.g. You couldn't do nothin'), "invariant be" (e.g. It mostly be in the evening), pronominal apposition (e.g. My mother, she works), third person singular -s absence (e.g. He work out there), and participial past (e.g. Today I seen one) were included as grammatical features. Pre-consonantal l absence and the centralization of ay glide are examples of phonological features. Three of the sentences were unmarked in terms of socially diagnostic speech features.

All of the short stimuli were taken from the speech samples of informants used for the longer passages; four were excerpted from actual passages used previously and five were taken from different parts of the interview not included in the longer passages.

3.3.1.3 Tape Order

The completed tape (Table 1), then, included 21 speech samples, each 20-30 seconds in length, followed by 9 short utterances. In the following table the ethnic identity, (N=Negro, W=White), social class (I=Upper-middle, II=Lower-middle, III=Upper-working, IV=Lower-working)

and tape number of the passage from which it was excerpted are included for each recorded speech sample.

TABLE I

PSYCHOLINGUISTIC ATTITUDE BASIC TAPE ORDER

Sample No.	Ethnicity	Social Class
1.	N	III
2.	W	II
3.	N	II
4.	W	II
5.	N	II
6.	W	III
7.	N	IV
8.	N	I
9.	N	IV
10.	W	III
11.	W	I
12.	N	II
13.	N	IV
14.	W	II
15.	N	I
16.	N	III
17.	N	I
18.	W	I
19.	N	III
20.	W	III
	Single Sentence Utterances	
1.	N	I
2.	W	III
3.	N	III
4.	N	II
5.	W	III
6.	W	I
7.	N	I
8.	N	III
9.	W	II

To control for any fatigue or order effect a second tape order was established in which numbers 1-10 and 11-21 were reversed.

Each stimulus was repeated on the tape. A sample passage was incorporated in order to orient the listener to the general procedure which would be followed in playing the tape. This sample had an accompanying sample sheet (See Questionnaire Section 3.3.2) on which the respondent could designate his classification of the speech passage. The length of the entire tape was 20 minutes and 13 seconds.

3.3.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. Section One was concerned with responses to the longer speech utterances; Section Two was concerned with the shorter utterances, and Section Three consisted of a response sheet for the semantic differential of the language concepts. Two forms of the questionnaire were constructed.

3.3.2.1 Form A

For each of the 21 sample speech passages (Section One of the questionnaire) the respondent was asked to choose a) the race of the speaker, b) to specify the social class of the speaker by education and occupation and c) to judge his speech sample on a semantic differential scale.

The social class response sheet was constructed in the following manner. The educational background of informants from each of the four social classes was examined to determine the typical educational level for each social class. In addition, occupations of individuals within

each social class level were catalogued. Pre-testing of a form which caused the respondent to make two choices, one of educational level and one of occupation, indicated that a less complex form could be constructed which allowed the respondent to make one choice. This social class response was then constructed so that a synopsis of a potential educational occupational background of a speaker from each of the four classes was presented.

The semantic differential response to the speech sample contained the following five scales:

Presumed Potency Factor:

Thick-Thin

Tense-Relaxed

Presumed Evaluation Factor:

Graceful-Awkward

Correct-Incorrect

Presumed Activity Factor:

Formal-Informal

So as to decrease set responses, the order and placement of the scales were varied with each response item. The format for each of the 21 stimuli is presented below:

a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

( ) 1. College graduate usually with graduate training. Dentist, mechanical engineer, personnel manager.

( ) 2. High school graduate, probably some college or technical school. Printer, post office clerk, small business owner or manager.

( ) 3. Some high school, or high school graduate.
Bus driver, carpenter, telephone lineman.

( ) 4. Not beyond 8th grade.
Dishwasher, night watchman, construction laborer.

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

correct ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ incorrect

awkward ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ graceful

relaxed ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ tense

formal ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ informal

thin ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ thick

For the nine short utterances (Section Two) respondents only selected a) the race of the speaker and b) his education-occupation level. The questionnaire format for Section Two is presented below:

a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

( ) 1. College graduate usually with graduate training.
Dentist, mechanical engineer, personnel manager.

( ) 2. High school graduate, probably some college or technical school. Printer, post office clerk, small business owner or manager.

( ) 3. Some high school, or high school graduate.
Bus driver, carpenter, telephone lineman.

( ) 4. Not beyond 8th grade.
Dishwasher, night watchman, construction laborer.

Section Three of the questionnaire involved semantic differential responses to the following concepts rather than to taped stimuli: Detroit speech, White Southern speech, British speech, Negro speech and standard speech.

The following twelve scales representing the evaluative, potency and activity factors were selected as response items:

Presumed Evaluative	Presumed Potential	Presumed Active
good - bad	thin - thick	fast - slow
positive - negative	strong - weak	complex - simple
dumb -smart	smooth - rough	sloppy - careful
valuable - worthless	dull - sharp	difficult - easy

Again, to reduce the tendency toward a response set, the scales were randomly ordered for each concept. The format for Section Three is illustrated below:

NEGRO SPEECH

worthless	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	valuable
dull	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	sharp
difficult	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	easy
positive	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	negative
rough	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	smooth
weak	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	strong
fast	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	slow
sloppy	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	careful
complex	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	simple
thick	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	thin
bad	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	good
smart	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	dumb

3.3.2.2 Form B

Form B differed from Form A only in part c) of Section One. A single scale, correct-incorrect, was substituted for the five scale semantic differential response on Form A. The format for each of the 21 stimuli was as follows:

a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

( ) 1. College graduate usually with graduate training. Dentist, mechanical engineer, personnel manager.

( ) 2. High school graduate, probably some college or technical school. Printer, post office clerk, small business owner or manager.

( ) 3. Some high school, or high school graduate. Bus driver, carpenter, telephone lineman.

( ) 4. Not beyond 8th grade. Dishwasher, night watchman, construction laborer.

c) Do you think this speech is: Correct ( ) Incorrect ( )

3.3.3 Test Administration

Three areas involved in test administration will be described in this section. These include 1) the pre-testing experimentation 2) the selection of respondents and 3) the instructions and actual administration of the test.

3.3.3.1 The Pre-testing

Before the instrument was used on the Detroit sample, several pre-testing experiments with the tape were conducted. The purpose of the pre-testing was:

1) to see if the different age and class levels could adequately handle the task which was being requested of them.

2) to test the reliability of the informants in each cell (i.e. Did the subjects respond similarly to the three informants in each cell?)

3) to see if the instructions were adequate and if the test could be completed in the allotted time.

4) to determine if the acoustic quality of the tape was adequate for use in a classroom.

In the pre-testing several different types of groups were chosen. These groups, of both races, included an adult group composed mainly of Class IV subjects, a teen age group composed of Class III, and IV subjects, a pre-adolescent group composed mainly of Class I and II subjects. On the basis of the pre-testing several procedures concerning the administration of the test were adopted.

In the first place, it was evident that the task of responding to speech samples with a semantic differential was too complex for Class III and IV respondents of all ages. In addition to difficulty in using the semantic differential as a response to a speech passage, the semantic differential task seemed to interfere with adequate performance on identification of ethnicity and social class. It was found, however, that Class I and II respondents of all ages, did not have this difficulty. On the basis of this difficulty two different forms of the questionnaire (See Questionnaire Form A, Form B) were administered. Form A, which included the five scale semantic differential, was then used for audiences estimated as Class I and II, and Form B which had only one scale was given to

respondents estimated as Class III or IV subjects.[1]

In addition, the pre-testing indicated that in order to complete the questionnaire within a 45 minute class period (a necessary time limit for use in school settings) some further editing of the tape was necessary. Thus, a time limitation of 25 minutes for playing the tape was adopted.

The acoustic quality of the tape for group sessions was judged satisfactory on the basis of the pre-testing. Experimenting with several different tape recorders indicated that the fidelity of the Wollensak T. 1500, the recorder used in the actual testing was adequate for playing the tape to the groups.

Finally, the pre-testing revealed there were a few questions which were consistently raised in connection with the instructions. Generally these questions had to do with the meaning of certain words used in the semantic differential (e.g. what do "thick" and "thin" mean in reference to speech, what is "standard speech"). Several modifications in the instructions and standardized answers to "typical questions" were adopted on the basis of the pre-testing (e.g. standard speech was described as the type of speech one might hear from a national TV news commentator).

3.3.3.2 Selection of Respondents

The sample of respondents was designed to include four factors:

1) race

White
Negro

---

1 Naturally there was some mixture of social classes in a number of groups in which the test was given. In instances where Class III and Class IV respondents were given Form A, the responses were eliminated from the final tabulation.

2) socio-economic status

Upper-Middle
Lower-Middle
Upper-Working
Lower-Working

3) age

10-12 years olds (6th grade)

16-18 years olds (11th grade)

Over 21 years old

4) sex

Male

Female

Assignment of the social class status of a respondent was determined in the same manner as it was for the speakers of the stimulus tape.

Table 2 presents the distribution of subjects (Ss across the four variables of race, social class age and sex).

TABLE 2

RESPONDENTS TO TAPE

		Children		Teen-agers		Adults		
		M	F	M	F	M	F	
	I	9	10	7	10	15	9	60
NEGRO	II	18	24	11	14	10	10	87
	III	15	9	6	8	10	8	56
	IV	11	11	6	8	9	8	53
		53	54	30	40	44	35	256
		M	F	M	F	M	F	
WHITE	I	22	26	23	9	12	15	107
	II	16	15	14	22	11	8	86
	III	20	27	11	10	8	8	84
	IV	24	29	5	6	12	11	87
		82	97	53	47	43	42	364
	TOTAL SAMPLE	135	151	83	87	87	77	620

The respondents were drawn from several sources (Table 3).

TABLE 3

SOURCES FOR RESPONDENT

Elementary Schools (6th grade)[1]

Chrysler
Hampton
Burgess
Morley
Atkinson
Koschiusko
Halley
St. Theresa
Burton Higgins

High Schools (11th grade)

Mumford
Southwestern
Chadsey
Murray Wright
Coolic
St. Martin de Pores
Cass
Cody

Adult Groups

McNamara Skills Training Center
Manpower
UAW Activity Center
Duffield Teacher Training Class
Kronk Activity Center
Aid for Dependent Children Center
Blessed Sacrament Faculty
Home Interviews

---

1 The 6th and 11th grade respondents were obtained through the Detroit public school system. Schools in which different social and ethnic composition might be found were chosen in consultation with officials of Public Schools. The adult subjects were obtained through several different means, including civic organizations, special adult educational programs and small group or individual interviews in the homes of subjects.

3.3.3.3 Instructions

The actual testing was done by two interracial teams, each consisting of two persons. One administrator was responsible for giving the basic instructions, while the other was responsible for answering individual questions which arose during the course of the instructions. The standard instructions were as follows:

Instruction:

Today we're going to see how much you can tell about a person just from the way he talks. You know how you can tell a lot about a person just from hearing him on the telephone. Well, this is the same sort of thing.

We're going to listen to a number of different speakers on tape talking about different topics. Some of these men are Negroes, some are white. First, we want to see if you can identify whether the man is Negro or white. On your sample sheet in Category a, we want you to check whether you think the man is Negro or white. Sometimes you may not be sure, but make your best guess.

These men also have different jobs and types of education. In part b, four different educational/job categories are listed. They are:

1) This person is a college graduate and usually has some training beyond college. Typical jobs are dentist, mechanical engineer or personnel manager. Or he might be a doctor, an automobile executive, etc.

2) This person has graduated from high school and usually has some college or technical school. Typical jobs might be a printer, post office clerk, small business owner or manager. Or he might be an insurance salesman, real estate man, etc.

3) This person has some high school and may or may not have graduated. Typical jobs are a bus driver, carpenter, telephone lineman, etc.

4) This person usually has not gone past 8th grade and might work as a dishwasher, night watchman, construction laborer, etc.

Now as you listen to the tape see if you can guess into which of the four categories this might person might fit. Remember, Number 1 is the highest and 4 the lowest job/education level. Now let's listen to the tape. Check the race of the speaker and the education/job level of the man.

(Play sample tape first time)

By now you should have two marks on your sample sheet, one for the race of the speaker and one for the education/job level.

Instructions for Form A

Now look at part e. Here we have five different pairs of words which people might sometimes use to describe how others speak. They are correct or incorrect, awkward or graceful, relaxed or tense, formal or informal and thin or thick. We want you to describe what you think of the person's speech. Between each pair of words you'll see a number of places where you can mark what you think of the speech. For example, if you think the person's speech is very correct mark it in the space right next to correct, if you think its quite correct mark it in the next space, if you think it is just slightly correct mark it in the next space; if, on the other hand, you think it is neither correct nor incorrect mark it right in the middle, if you think it is slightly incorrect mark it in the next space, if you think it is quite incorrect mark it in the next space and if you think it is very incorrect mark it right next to incorrect.

(Illustrate on board)

Correct 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : INCORRECT

Do this for each pair of words, so that when you are finished you have five checks for part e. Now let's listen again to the tape being played the second time while you fill in part e. (Play tape second time).

By this time you should have the entire sample complete with seven checks, one for the race of the speaker, one for the educational/job level and one for each of the five pairs of words. Be sure to read each pair of words for every sample because they are not always in the same order. The number will be given before each sample and each sample will be played twice. Be sure you are marking the correct number in the booklet and that you have seven checks for each one.

Instructions for Form B

Now look at Part e. There you see two categories correct and and incorrect. While you're listening to the sample the second time mark whether the speech sounds correct or incorrect to you. (Play tape second time).

By this time you should have checked either correct or incorrect. You should have three checks, one for the race of the speaker, one for the educational/job level of the person and one for the correct or incorrect English. Now we will listen to No. 1-21. The number will be given before each sample and each one will be played twice. Be sure you are marking the correct number in the booklet and that you have three checks for each one.

Instructions for the Short Passages

Now we will do the same thing we did in parts a and b in the first 21 samples, however, this time, the person on the tape will only say one sentence. Each sentence will be played twice. You should have two checks for each speech sample you hear, one for the race of the speaker and one for the education/job level.

Instructions for Semantic Differential

In this section there is nothing to listen to. You will fill in your reactions to certain kinds of speech just like you did in part c. At the top of the page you will see a word or phrase describing a certain type of speech. We want you to check what you think of that kind of speech by checking a space in each of the twelve pairs of words. For example, say you had New England Speech at the top of the page. If you thought it sounded very fast you would mark it right next to the word fast. If you thought it was quite fast, mark it in the next space, etc. Do this for each pair of the words. You should have twelve checks, one for each pair of words. Do this for Detroit Speech, White Southern Speech, British Speech, Negro Speech, and Standard Speech.

When you are through make sure all the information on the first page is filled out and turn in your booklet.

3.4 Results

This study was concerned with the ability of an individual to identify the race and socio-economic status of adult males from a sample of their speech. The following listener variables were investigated: race (Negro and white), age (child, teen-ager and adult),

sex (male and female) and socio-economic status (SES) (status levels I, II, III, and IV as described in Section 3.3).

The data in this study are based upon the responses of 620 Ss (Table 2). Of the 620 Ss, 286 were children (sixth graders), 170 were teen-agers (eleventh graders) and 164 were adults. 256 Ss were Negro and 364 were white. 305 Ss were male and 315 were female. Ss were distributed across socio-economic class (SES) in the following manner: SES I - 167, SES II - 173, SES III - 140 and SES IV - 140.

Since the results represent percentages and means and no further analyses were done, the results are to be regarded as suggestive and promising rather than conclusive.

The results deal with 1) the ability to correctly identify the race and socio-economic status of an individual by listening to a sample of his speech,[1] 2) with semantic differential responses to speech samples and 3) with semantic differential responses to certain speech concepts.

3.4.1 The Identification of Race and of SES

3.4.1.1 Race Identification

Can individuals correctly identify the race of a person from a sample of his spoken language?

When responding to the longer utterances (Section One, part a) Ss correctly identified Negro speakers 80.0% of the time and correctly identified white speakers 81.2% of the time.

---

1 In as much as the stimuli in Section Two were included as a pilot for possible future research, the data from that section were not analyzed for inclusion in this report.

What is the effect of race of the respondent upon identification of race of the speaker?

Table 4 presents the data concerning the effect of the race of the respondent on identification of the race of the speaker.

TABLE 4

EFFECT OF RACE OF RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF RACE OF SPEAKER

	Stimuli	
	Negro	White
Respondents		
Negro	82.2	76.9
White	78.4	84.1

On the whole, whites identify whites slightly better than they identify Negroes and Negroes identify Negroes better than they identify whites.

Negroes identify Negroes slightly better than whites identify Negroes and whites identify whites more accurately than Negroes do.

What is the effect of age on identification of race of speakers?

Table 5 presents the data concerning age and identification of race.

TABLE 5

EFFECT OF AGE OF RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF RACE OF SPEAKER

	Stimuli	
	Negro	White
Respondents		
children	79.7	74.3
teen-agers	81.5	88.6
adults	79.1	85.6

Teen-agers and adults are more accurate on identification of whites than are children.

There is no apparent age effect in identification of Negroes.

Children are more accurate in identifying Negro speakers whereas teen-agers and adults are more accurate in identifying white speakers.

What is the effect of respondents' SES on correct identification of race?

Table 6 presents the data concerning SES of respondent and identification of race.

TABLE 6

EFFECT OF SES OF RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF RACE OF SPEAKER

	Stimuli	
	Negro	White
Respondents		
SES I	80.5	86.5
SES II	80.9	80.8
SES III	79.7	80.3
SES IV	78.6	76.1

Ability to correctly identify race decreases slightly with decrease in SES. This is especially true for identification of white speakers.

SES respondents identify white speakers better than they do Negroes. SES IV do slightly better on identification of Negro speakers.

What is the effect of the sex of the listener on his ability to identify the race of a speaker?

Table 7 presents the data concerning sex of respondent and identification of race of speaker.

TABLE 7

EFFECT OF SEX OF RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF RACE OF SPEAKER

	Stimuli	
	Negro	White
Respondent		
Male	80.2	82.6
Female	79.8	79.9

Males identify whites slightly better than they identify Negroes. However, sex generally does not appear to contribute significantly to the identification of race.

Do white and Negro male and female respondents of various ages differ in their ability to identify the ethnicity of speakers?

Table 8 presents the data concerning the responses of white and Negro children, teen-agers and adults to stimuli A.

TABLE 8

EFFECT OF AGE, RACE, AND SEX ON IDENTIFICATION OF RACE OF SPEAKER

	Stimuli	
	Negro	White
Respondents		
Negro child male	79.1	67.7
Negro child female	77.5	66.4
Negro teen male	83.3	86.8
Negro teen female	84.8	83.4
Negro adult male	85.8	71.6
Negro adult female	86.2	74.4
White child male	81.4	78.4
White child female	79.0	78.9
White teen male	79.4	90.8
White teen female	80.1	91.5
White adult male	76.6	89.7
White adult female	74.4	85.2

It appears that ability to recognize one's racial group improves between 6th grade and teens but there is little difference between teen-agers and adults.

Except for Negro teen-agers and white 6th graders, all groups do appreciatively better recognizing their own racial than the other racial group.

There is little difference between sexes in ability to identify race.

Identification of "out group" is different between whites and Negroes. Whites fluctuate 10% across age in ability to identify whites. Here children do the least well, adults next and teen-agers are most accurate in identifying white speakers.

3.4.1.2 SES Identification

Can individuals correctly identify the social class of a person from a sample of his spoken language?

In response to Section One, part b, social class was correctly identified as follows: SES I - 29.6%, SES II - 31.8%, SES III - 40.8%, and SES IV - 60.8%. Overall ability to identify correctly SES appears to increase as the SES of the speaker decreases.

What is the effect of the race of the respondent on the ability to identify the SES of speaker?

Table 9 illustrates the effect of race on identification of SES of speaker.

TABLE 9

EFFECT OF RACE OF RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF SES OF SPEAKER

	Stimuli			
	SES I	SES II	SES III	SES IV
Respondents				
Negro	30.7	30.3	43.5	66.1
White	28.9	32.9	38.9	58.1

Generally, whites are less accurate than Negroes in assigning SES to speakers but this difference may only be significant for SES III and SES IV speakers.

What is the effect of age on the identification of SES speakers? Table 10 presents the data concerning age and identification of SES.

TABLE 10

EFFECT OF AGE OF THE RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF SES OF THE SPEAKER

	Stimuli			
	SES I	SES II	SES III	SES IV
Respondents				
Children	27.1	32.1	33.6	42.0
Teen-agers	30.4	33.0	49.2	74.0
Adults	33.4	30.1	44.6	80.0

Except in response to SES III where all groups appear somewhat comparable, teen-agers and adults more often than children correctly identify the SES of speakers.

Generally, the identification of SES increases for all respondents as the SES of the speaker decreases. That is, the lower the status of the speaker the greater the accuracy in SES identification.

All age groups appear to identify SES IV speakers significantly better than the other SES levels.

What is the effect of SES of the respondent on identification of SES of the speaker?

Table 11 presents the data concerning identification of SES and its relationship to the SES level of the respondent.

TABLE 11

EFFECT OF SES OF RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF SES OF SPEAKER

	Stimuli			
	SES I	SES II	SES III	SES IV
Respondents				
SES I	40.6	37.5	43.4	62.1
SES II	28.5	31.2	42.1	64.9
SES III	32.7	30.3	39.7	58.8
SES IV	24.9	29.5	37.2	56.3

SES I respondents do considerably better than other SES groups in identifying SES I.

SES IV speakers are most often correctly identified regardless of the SES of the respondent.

SES I respondents appear to perform significantly better than SES IV respondents on overall SES identification.

Generally, accuracy in the identification of SES increases with increase in the SES status of the respondent.

What is the effect of the sex of the respondent on his ability to identify the SES of the speaker?

Table 12 presents the data concerning the sex of the respondent on identification of SES of the stimuli.

TABLE 12

EFFECT OF SEX OF THE RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF SES OF THE SPEAKER

	Stimuli			
	SES I	SES II	SES III	SES IV
Respondents				
Male	29.5	33.1	42.4	60.7
Female	29.7	30.3	39.3	61.0

No appreciable difference appears concerning the sex of the respondent and his ability to correctly identify SES.

3.4.1.3 Race and SES Identification

How accurate are individuals at identifying the race and SES of speakers?

Table 13 presents the data concerning the identification of race and SES.

TABLE 13

CORRECT IDENTIFICATION OF RACE AND SES OF SPEAKERS

Negro Speaker Stimuli				White Speaker		
SES I	SES II	SES III	SES IV	SES I	SES II	SES III
12.2	20.2	41.8	52.6	34.5	33.8	28.3

It appears that accurate identification of race and SES of Negro speakers increases as their SES decreases, whereas the converse is true for the identification of white speakers. That is, accuracy of identification of race and SES for white speakers increases with an increase in SES.

What is the effect of race of the respondent on identification of race and SES of a speaker?

Table 14 presents the data concerning the effect of the variable of race on identification of race and socio-economic status of a speaker.

TABLE 14

EFFECT OF RACE OF RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF RACE AND SES OF SPEAKER

	Stimuli						
	N I	N II	N III	N IV	W I	W II	W III
Respondent							
Negro	17.8	20.4	44.0	57.5	27.3	29.2	32.7
White	8.2	20.2	40.3	49.2	39.5	37.0	25.2

Negro listeners are more accurate on identification of race and SES of a speaker as the SES of the speaker decreases. Whites, on the other hand, are more accurate in identifying white speakers' SES as the SES increases. Whites are more accurate in identification of Negroes as the SES of Negroes decreases.

Negroes are more accurate than whites in identifying N I speakers, whereas whites are better than Negroes in identifying W I speakers. Of all race and SES groups, N IV speakers are most accurately identified by both white and Negro respondents.

What is the effect of age on ability to identify race and socio-economic status of a speaker?

The data on correct ethno-social identification by children, teen-agers and adults are presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15

EFFECT OF RACE AND SES OF RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF RACE AND SES OF SPEAKERS

	Stimuli						
	N I	N II	N III	N IV	W I	W II	W III
Respondent							
Children	9.6	21.6	35.5	35.5	31.5	30.7	17.9
Teen-ager	13.5	19.8	51.0	63.9	37.4	39.6	39.6
Adults	15.4	18.4	43.4	71.0	36.7	33.1	35.0

Teen-agers, more often than children, correctly identify the race and SES of speakers, especially in regard to identification of Negro SES speakers.[7] But there is no significant difference between teens and adults.

Is there a difference in identification of race and SES by individuals of varying SES?

Table 16 presents the data on identification of race and SES of Ss of various SES levels.

TABLE 16

EFFECT OF SES OF RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF RACE AND SES

	Stimuli						
	N I	N II	N III	N IV	W I	W II	W III
Respondent							
SES I	16.2	24.2	42.7	53.3	48.7	40.3	34.1
SES II	13.0	19.0	44.1	56.6	34.2	33.5	28.1
SES III	10.4	18.8	40.9	50.7	25.3	33.7	25.6
SES IV	8.2	18.4	38.9	48.9	27.0	26.4	24.4

SES I and II respondents generally are more accurate than SES III and IV respondents on the identification of race and SES of speakers.

Accuracy for all SES respondents increases for Negro speakers as the SES of Negro speakers decreases, and increases for whites as their SES increases. SES III and IV respondents, however, appear to do equally well in identification of white speakers regardless of their SES level. That is, they identify WI's, WII's, and WIII's with the same degree of efficiency.

Do women and men perform equally well on racial-socio-economic class identification of speakers?

Table 17 presents the data concerning male and female respondents' identification of race and SES.

TABLE 17

EFFECT OF SEX OF RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF RACE AND SES

	N I	N II	N III	N IV	W I	W II	W III
Respondent							
Male	12.5	20.9	44.2	53.2	33.0	35.9	29.3
Female	11.9	19.6	39.5	52.1	35.9	31.7	27.4

Although males appear to identify N III speakers and W II speakers slightly better than females, overall there appears to be no significant difference between males and females on the identification of race and SES of speakers.

What is the effect of race, sex and age on ability to correctly assign speakers concerning race and SES?

Table 18 gives the data concerning race, sex and age on listeners' judgments of race and SES of a speaker.

TABLE 18

EFFECT OF AGE, RACE AND SEX OF RESPONDENT ON IDENTIFICATION OF RACE AND SES

Respondents	N I	N II	N III	N IV	W I	W II	W III
Negro child male	15.1	21.4	35.2	35.8	23.3	26.4	18.9
Negro child female	14.1	22.7	38.7	35.8	22.4	23.2	22.0
Negro teen male	24.4	17.8	52.2	65.6	22.2	36.7	35.6
Negro teen female	19.2	19.3	49.2	65.8	31.9	35.8	49.2
Negro adult male	17.1	20.6	53.8	81.4	36.4	30.0	44.6
Negro adult female	21.4	18.3	40.4	78.8	28.8	27.2	34.6
White child male	9.4	23.3	36.2	35.0	29.7	38.3	18.4
White child female	4.1	19.6	33.3	35.7	42.6	30.9	14.8
White teen male	7.5	19.5	53.5	58.5	44.0	42.8	36.5
White teen female	8.5	22.0	48.9	67.4	44.3	41.1	37.1
White adult male	8.5	20.2	44.2	65.9	41.9	39.5	34.1
White adult female	15.9	14.3	34.1	59.2	38.1	33.9	26.2

Female Negro children do better on the identification of upper SES Negroes whereas white female children are considerably more accurate than their Negro counterparts in identifying SES I and II white speakers.

Of the female respondents, teen-agers do best on overall identification of race and SES of speakers.

Greatest accuracy appears generally in the identification of N IV speakers.

Identification of N III's and N IV speakers is considerably greater than for N I and N II speakers for all groups.

Generally, there is no difference between male and female children except for white female children, who do better in identifying W I speakers.

Negro male teen-agers do better than Negro female teen-agers in identifying N I speakers, but they do more poorly on identification of W I and W III speakers.

Negro males are more accurate than white males on identification of Negroes and vice-versa.

3.4.2 Semantic Differential Responses to Speech

Two forms of the semantic differential were administered in part c of Section One. Form A which consisted of five scales was administered to 340 SES I and SES II Ss. Form B which consisted of one scale was administered to 280 SES III and SES IV Ss. Both Forms A and B contained the correct-incorrect scale.

Can subjects make judgments on a semantic differential in response to speech samples?

Ss asked to rate speech samples on a correct-incorrect scale tended to regard Negro speech as more incorrect ($\bar{M}$ = 4.47) than white speech ($\bar{M}$ = 3.70) which they rated as slightly incorrect. This is not unexpected since our speech samples included N IV speakers but no W IV speakers. Over all Ss, the correct value of speech decreased with a decrease in SES. SES I speakers were rated as slightly correct ($\bar{M}$ = 2.86) whereas SES II speakers were rated as slightly incorrect ($\bar{M}$ = 3.85). SES III speakers were rated quite incorrect ($\bar{M}$ = 4.93) and SES IV speakers, all of whom were Negroes, were rated considerably incorrect ($\bar{M}$ = 5.71).

A breakdown of the responses to the different race and SES of the speakers in terms of respondent variables revealed some interesting differences (Table 19).

TABLE 19

RESPONSE MEANS TO SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Male & Female Respondents	Negro stimuli				White stimuli		
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III
C	3.26	4.27	4.44	5.32	2.70	3.34	4.71
T	3.13	4.46	4.87	5.97	2.52	3.44	5.35
A	3.13	4.01	4.93	5.95	2.29	3.55	5.53
N	3.02	4.25	4.81	5.88	2.65	3.33	5.03
W	3.31	4.28	4.64	5.57	2.44	3.51	5.24
Ss	3.18	4.27	4.72	5.71	2.53	3.43	5.15

Negroes and whites generally tended to view W I speakers as slightly more correct than N I speakers. On the other hand, W III speakers were judged more incorrect than N III speakers by all Ss.

There did not appear to be an age difference in semantic differential responses to speech stimuli.

W I speakers were judged to be most correct by all respondents whereas N IV speakers were judged as most incorrect.

Over all SES II white speech is seen as slightly correct whereas SES II Negro speech is seen as more neutral.

SES operates differently in relation to the race of the speaker in semantic differential responses. For Negro speakers SES I is regarded as quite different from SES II and III that are seen as quite similar, while SES IV is even more distinctly evaluated. For white

speakers, SES I and II are viewed as quite similar but definitely different from SES III.

When Ss were asked to rate speech samples on a graceful-awkward scale, Negro speech was rated as more awkward ($\bar{M}$ = 4.47) than white speech ($\bar{M}$ = 4.23). A further breakdown of responses is presented in Table 20.

TABLE 20

RESPONSE MEANS TO SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
GRACEFUL-AWKWARD

Respondents	Negro I	Negro II	Negro III	Negro IV	White I	White II	White III
C	3.93	4.65	4.96	5.64	3.49	4.25	4.81
T	3.69	4.73	5.02	5.86	3.35	4.10	5.23
A	3.73	4.49	5.01	5.44	3.42	4.21	5.24
N	3.61	4.54	4.92	5.71	3.39	4.04	4.96
W	3.94	4.71	5.05	5.63	3.45	4.31	5.16
Ss	3.79	4.63	4.99	5.66	3.42	4.19	5.07

SES is an important factor. The lower the SES the greater the awkward loading. Age does not appear to be a factor in rating of speech samples on the graceful-awkward.

Negroes and whites rate speakers in a similar manner.

In response to the formal-informal scale, Ss generally rated Negro speech ($\bar{M}$ = 2.90) as considerably informal whereas white speech was rated as slightly informal ($\bar{M}$ = 3.40).

A closer inspection of the data (Table 21) reveals that age and race of respondent are important factors.

TABLE 21

RESPONSE MEANS TO SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
INFORMAL-FORMAL SCALE

Respondents	Negro I	Negro II	Negro III	Negro IV	White I	White II	White III
C	3.55	3.39	3.19	2.66	4.25	3.59	3.03
T	3.35	2.77	2.74	2.04	4.21	3.10	2.48
A	3.45	2.80	2.51	2.00	4.28	3.17	2.31
N	3.89	3.20	2.95	2.27	4.24	3.62	2.91
W	3.10	2.88	2.77	2.27	4.25	3.05	2.44
Ss	3.45	3.02	2.85	2.27	4.24	3.31	2.65

Children tend to rate Negro speech as less informal than teenagers and adults.

White SES I speech is rated as more formal than Negro SES I speech. The interaction of race and SES is not maintained as strongly at other SES levels.

Negro respondents rate N I speakers as slightly formal whereas white respondents rate N I speakers as slightly informal. Negro respondents, on the other hand, rate W II speakers as slightly more formal than do white respondents.

Responses on the tense-relaxed scale are presented in Table 22.

TABLE 22

RESPONSE MEANS TO SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
TENSE-RELAXED SCALE

Respondent	Negro I	Negro II	Negro III	Negro IV	White I	White II	White III
C	4.82	4.27	4.20	3.93	4.66	4.52	4.13
T	5.06	4.09	4.06	4.14	4.76	4.53	4.08
A	4.91	4.60	4.53	4.55	4.70	4.84	4.56
N	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.09	4.78	4.74	4.24
W	4.86	4.25	4.21	4.23	4.64	4.51	4.22
Ss	4.93	4.30	4.24	4.17	4.71	4.61	4.23

Responses on the tense-relaxed scale indicate that speech tends to be rated as more tense as SES decreases. Negroes and whites appear to respond similarly to the stimuli.

Age seems to be of minimal importance.

Responses on the thick-thin scale are presented in Table 23.

TABLE 23

RESPONSE MEANS TO SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
THICK-THIN SCALE

Respondents	Negro I	Negro II	Negro III	Negro IV	White I	White II	White III
C	4.01	3.28	3.04	3.32	3.41	4.10	3.92
T	4.07	3.18	2.90	3.07	3.87	4.20	3.80
A	3.86	3.17	2.68	2.46	4.16	4.16	3.49
N	4.00	3.21	2.81	2.90	3.73	4.15	3.74
W	3.99	5.23	2.96	3.10	3.76	4.15	3.79
Ss	3.99	3.22	2.90	3.01	3.75	4.15	3.77

No consistent response pattern is evident with the thick-thin scale. The results suggest that the concepts thick-thin are not applicable for the judgment of speech.

3.4.3 Semantic Differential Responses to Speech Concepts

Five concepts: Detroit Speech, White Southern Speech, British Speech, Negro Speech and Standard Speech were presented to all Ss. The responses to the various concepts will be discussed in relation to the following listener variables: race, sex, age and SES.

3.4.3.1 Effect of Race of Respondent

Table 24 presents the responses of white and Negro Ss to the different speech concepts.

TABLE 24

RESPONSE MEANS ON SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSES: RACE

	DETROIT SPEECH		WHITE SOUTHERN SPEECH		BRITISH SPEECH		NEGRO SPEECH		STANDARD SPEECH	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
good-bad	3.31	3.44	4.71	4.34	3.25	3.32	3.70	4.51	2.96	2.82
positive-negative	3.72	3.54	4.67	4.17	3.47	3.47	3.79	4.25	3.64	3.29
smart-dumb	3.34	3.40	4.92	4.39	3.22	3.13	3.67	4.44	3.25	2.87
valuable-worthless	3.31	3.45	4.61	4.16	3.48	3.37	3.35	4.19	3.14	2.84
smooth-rough	3.70	3.82	4.75	4.15	3.53	3.46	3.95	4.88	3.46	3.24
fast-slow	3.75	3.69	5.16	4.62	3.19	3.34	3.96	4.18	3.78	3.63
difficult-easy	4.70	4.63	3.73	3.89	3.50	3.41	4.71	3.81	4.36	4.26
complex-simple	4.48	4.18	4.58	4.49	3.37	3.24	4.60	4.37	4.11	3.83
thick-thin	3.87	3.99	3.57	3.42	3.93	3.85	3.38	3.07	4.06	4.01
strong-weak	3.15	3.29	4.13	3.86	3.31	3.15	3.03	3.49	3.25	3.19
sharp-dull	3.46	3.61	5.12	4.52	3.39	3.28	3.57	4.53	3.38	3.10
careful-sloppy	3.69	3.81	4.87	4.70	3.37	3.01	3.90	4.85	3.00	2.88

The race of Ss was an important factor in response to the concepts Negro Speech and White Southern Speech. Negroes generally viewed Negro speech less pejoratively than white respondents.

On the other hand, Negroes judged White Southern Speech more pejoratively than did white respondents.

Whites saw less difference between White Southern and Negro Speech than did Negroes.

Negroes judged Negro Speech quite similarly to their judgment of Detroit Speech whereas white speakers saw a greater difference between Detroit Speech and White Southern Speech.

Both whites and Negroes judged the concept Detroit Speech in a similar manner.

Overall, Detroit Speech, British Speech, and Standard Speech were not viewed pejoratively.

3.4.3.2 Effect of Sex of Respondent on Speech Concepts

In Table 25 the effect of sex on the responses is presented.

TABLE 25

RESPONSE MEANS ON SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL: SEX

	DETROIT SPEECH		WHITE SOUTHERN SPEECH		BRITISH SPEECH		NEGRO SPEECH		STANDARD SPEECH	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
good-bad	3.36	3.42	4.52	4.46	3.25	3.32	4.15	4.20	2.97	2.79
positive-negative	3.55	3.67	4.39	4.36	3.42	3.52	4.01	4.11	3.43	3.43
smart-dumb	3.34	3.40	4.66	4.56	3.24	3.09	4.09	4.16	3.08	2.96
valuable-worthless	3.39	3.40	4.43	4.26	3.45	3.38	3.87	3.83	3.06	2.86
smooth-rough	3.86	3.68	4.40	4.38	3.46	3.51	4.45	4.55	3.31	3.33
fast-slow	3.69	3.74	4.79	4.89	3.39	3.17	4.09	4.09	3.79	3.60
difficult-easy	4.74	4.58	3.80	3.85	3.56	3.34	4.26	4.10	4.24	4.36
complex-simple	4.36	4.25	4.43	4.62	3.33	3.26	4.44	4.48	4.04	3.85
thick-thin	3.80	4.07	3.55	3.41	3.78	3.99	3.17	3.22	3.98	4.09
strong-weak	3.30	3.17	3.91	4.02	3.27	3.17	3.18	3.41	3.25	3.18
sharp-dull	3.61	3.49	4.88	4.65	3.47	3.19	4.16	4.12	3.24	3.18
careful-sloppy	3.70	3.82	4.83	4.72	3.16	3.15	4.41	4.52	3.03	2.83

No significant difference between male and female responses obtains in Table 25.

3.4.3.3 Effect of Age of Respondent on Speech Concepts

The effect of the age of the respondent on judgments is presented in Table 26.

TABLE 26

RESPONSE MEANS ON SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL: AGE

	WHITE														
	DETROIT SPEECH			SOUTHERN SPEECH			BRITISH SPEECH			NEGRO SPEECH			STANDARD SPEECH		
	C	T	A	C	T	A	C	T	A	C	T	A	C	T	C
good-bad	3.29	3.57	3.38	4.36	4.59	4.63	3.38	3.16	3.25	4.07	4.39	4.13	2.85	2.99	2.81
positive-negative	3.60	3.65	3.59	4.28	4.34	4.58	3.67	3.54	3.03	4.18	3.93	3.99	3.63	3.42	3.06
smart-dumb	3.30	3.53	3.34	4.43	5.01	4.30	3.38	3.05	2.90	4.00	4.37	4.11	2.99	3.18	2.91
valuable-worthless	3.41	3.48	3.28	4.20	4.64	4.27	3.71	3.27	3.04	3.82	4.12	3.60	2.98	3.03	2.85
smooth-rough	3.73	3.92	3.69	4.47	4.29	4.35	3.65	3.33	3.35	4.51	4.62	4.36	3.45	3.35	3.08
fast-slow	3.88	3.52	3.62	4.26	4.93	5.78	3.48	2.97	3.24	3.91	4.05	4.44	3.84	3.53	3.60
difficult-easy	4.54	4.79	4.73	3.73	3.96	3.83	3.52	3.24	3.54	4.30	4.09	4.03	4.24	4.21	4.51
complex-simple	4.28	4.19	4.47	4.26	4.72	4.81	3.56	3.16	2.95	4.46	4.47	4.45	3.91	3.75	4.16
thick-thin	3.85	3.98	4.05	3.71	3.57	2.97	3.91	3.72	4.01	3.35	3.08	3.03	3.96	4.10	4.09
strong-weak	3.02	3.46	3.37	3.82	4.00	4.21	3.43	2.96	3.10	3.00	3.75	3.37	3.25	3.34	3.04
sharp-dull	3.53	3.54	3.60	4.43	4.97	5.15	3.57	3.12	3.12	4.04	4.26	4.19	3.19	3.48	2.97
careful-sloppy	3.58	4.16	3.67	4.53	5.01	4.94	3.38	3.19	2.71	4.19	4.86	4.56	2.86	3.22	2.74

Teenagers rate white Southern Speech more pejoratively on the smart-dumb scale than do children and adults. Adults rate white Southern Speech as slower on the slow-fast scale. Children seem to respond differently on the presumed potency scales than do adults and teenagers.

Generally, age is not a sharply differentiating factor in rating speech concepts on a semantic differential.

3.4.3.4 Effect of SES of Respondent to Speech Concepts

SES of respondent appears to play a role only in response to the concepts British Speech and White Southern Speech (Table 27).

The value of British Speech increases with an increase in SES.

White Southern Speech does not elicit responses that are as consistent as those to British Speech but does indicate that on scales it is valued less by SES I respondents than by SES IV respondents.

TABLE 27

RESPONSE MEANS ON SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL: SES

	DETROIT SPEECH				WHITE SOUTHERN SPEECH				BRITISH SPEECH				NEGRO SPEECH				STANDARD SPEECH			
	SES				SES				SES				SES				SES			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
good-bad	340	346	336	333	486	463	433	404	272	308	361	389	440	418	400	408	292	289	279	289
positive-negative	360	376	359	346	446	444	432	425	310	328	371	390	412	412	401	398	329	352	356	334
smart-dumb	338	325	354	334	490	466	451	428	284	295	349	350	425	416	404	403	315	295	300	296
valuable-worthless	352	344	344	314	458	438	439	395	316	321	360	378	380	392	386	381	295	286	289	315
smooth-rough	362	380	401	365	427	450	442	438	301	344	376	385	478	433	436	453	315	323	360	336
fast-slow	354	364	384	390	501	510	451	466	317	328	336	332	404	427	396	406	366	367	380	365
difficult-easy	464	473	433	493	378	382	384	386	366	332	337	342	392	411	416	458	414	437	444	427
complex-simple	416	424	435	453	483	456	445	421	323	322	357	329	441	442	438	465	391	394	401	391
thick-thin	407	398	377	388	340	339	368	349	418	381	370	382	284	307	366	331	423	411	379	395
strong-weak	333	328	328	303	402	407	377	399	286	300	350	362	320	351	338	308	327	323	306	330
sharp-dull	373	353	356	336	487	479	468	469	296	319	362	364	432	412	403	405	334	322	320	307
careful-sloppy	392	367	392	353	518	480	474	427	261	296	343	379	484	452	426	417	309	279	287	295

4. Study B

4.1 Rationale

The rationale behind the present study was to assess some of the motivational bases for teaching standard English to Negro non-standard speakers. We wanted to determine whether there was a relationship between job opportunity and speech patterns. If so, we wanted further to investigate whether prospective employees held attitudes towards specific speech patterns comparable to those of their prospective employers. In addition, we wanted to determine whether lower class teen-agers could identify and evaluate speech patterns that were similar to their own.

4.2 Research Questions

1. Is speech an important criterion for job opportunity?
2. How do teen-agers evaluate specific speech patterns in relation to employers' expectations?
3. Do teen-agers correlate "successful" speech with certain job opportunities?
4. Do teen-agers correlate "acceptable" speech with certain job opportunities?
5. Do teen agers correlate "acceptable" speech with "successful" speech?

4.3 Procedure

The basic instrument used in Study B was a tape recording of 16 speech samples representing different social and occupational levels of Negroes in Washington, D.C.

4.3.1 Stimulus Tape

4.3.1.2 Selection of Informants

The tape was set up to represent the speech of four different social classes of Negroes. The social classification of informants was based on an adaptation of the Hollingshead scale (1958) that was originally constructed for use in the Detroit Dialect Study (Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1968). The social classification scale used in Detroit was used in Washington, D.C.

The selection of informants for the tape included teen-agers (14-17) and adult (21-55) male Negroes. Each of the four social classes included two adult speakers and two teen-age informants. A total of 16 speakers equally distributed among four social classes and two age levels were included on the tape. All speakers were chosen from the sample informants of the Washington Dialect Study (See Fasold, forthcoming).

The two main criteria for the selection of informants for the tape were: 1) the informant should be a resident of Washington, D.C. for at least half of his life and preferably a lifetime resident 2) his speech should be evaluated as "representative" (in terms of particular linguistic features) of the social class to which he is assigned.

4.3.1.3 The Selection of Passages

The speech passages chosen for this study were taken from the discourse section of the interview conducted as a part of the Washington Dialect Study. The selection of passages for the tape was based on two criteria: 1) linguistic features in the passage should represent the particular social group of the informant 2) the passage should be as culturally "unmarked" as possible since the respondents were to react solely on the basis of linguistic variables. The evaluation of speech as "representative" of an informant's social group was based on a comparison

of the linguistic features in the passage with objective studies currently being undertaken on the social stratification of the speech of Negroes in Washington, D.C. (See Fasold, forthcoming). A team of three sociolinguists was ultimately responsible for designating the informants' speech as typical of the particular social group they were chosen to represent.

Passages dealing with informants' descriptions of movies were chosen because they were relatively "unmarked" culturally. Each passage was edited so that it was 20-30 seconds in length.

4.3.1.4 Tape Order

A tape consisting of 16 passages which were relatively comparable in terms of their cultural content was constructed. Each passage was repeated. The complete tape required 17 minutes and 32 seconds to play. Table 28 presents the tape order.

TABLE 28

STUDY B TAPE ORDER

Sample No.	Age	Social Class
1	teen	I
2	adult	IV
3	teen	II
4	teen	III
5	adult	I
6	adult	II
7	teen	IV
8	adult	I
9	teen	II

TABLE 28 (continued)

STUDY B TAPE ORDER

Sample No.	Age	Social Class
10	adult	III
11	teen	I
12	adult	III
13	teen	III
14	adult	IV
15	adult	II
16	teen	IV

4.3.2 Questionnaires

Two different types of questionnaires were used in this experiment, one for the employers and one for the 11th grade male students. In Questionnaire I (Appendix D, Section One) the employers were asked to respond to the 16 speech samples in the following manner: whether or not the speaker was employable, and if so, what three positions might he hold. The employer was asked to name specific jobs in his corporation or firm that might be available to the speaker. The format of this questionnaire was as follows:

(a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

(b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what positions in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

The same format was used for each of the 16 sample speech utterances. In addition, at the end of the stimulus tape the respondent was asked to describe in writing the extent to which he thought himself to be influenced by a person's speech in this process of hiring practices. ("In selecting an employee, to what extent are you influenced by his speech?").

In Questionnaire II (Appendix D, Section One) four different responses were required. First, the respondent was asked to rate (Yes-No) whether or not the person sounded successful based on the speech sample. Then, the respondent was asked if the speech sounded acceptable to him. Third, the respondent was asked if he thought that his friends sounded like the person on the tape. In part four, the respondent was asked to identify certain occupations which might be available to the person based solely on the speech sample. In this category 21 different specific occupations were given, from which the respondent might choose as many as he felt applied to the speech sample. The 21 different occupations were selected on the following basis: First, Warner's (1960: 140-141) "Revised Scale for Rating Occupations" was used to classify job categories given by the employers on a seven point rating scale. In each of the seven categories, two types of jobs actually listed by employers in Questionnaire I were selected for the list of 21 occupations. In addition, actual occupations from the informants on the stimulus tape were chosen to be placed on the list; one occupation on each of Warner's seven levels.

Thus, the occupations were a combination of actual jobs from informants on the tape and suggested jobs by the employers who responded to Questionnaire I. The occupations were then randomly distributed in

the list. The format for each response was as follows:

(a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

(b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

(c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

(d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

Laborer ☐	Janitor ☐	Newspaper reporter ☐
College professor ☐	Salesman ☐	Sales supervisor ☐
Key punch operator ☐	Doctor ☐	Fire chief ☐
Truck driver ☐	Printer ☐	Policeman ☐
Junior manager ☐	Bus-boy ☐	Drug store owner ☐
Mechanic ☐	Gas station attendant ☐	Stock clerk ☐
Architect ☐	Accountant ☐	Night watchman ☐

The same format was repeated for each of the sixteen speech passages which served as the stimuli.

4.3.3 Test Administration

The two main areas involved in the test administration include the selection of respondents and the instructions and actual administration of the test.

4.3.3.1 Selection of Respondents

In accordance with the two types of questionnaires which were used in elicitation of responses two basic types of respondents were chosen for the test. First, 16 employers in the Washington, D.C. area were chosen for Questionnaire I. These included employers representing a range of occupational categories. Each of these employers was responsible for interviewing and hiring people on several different occupational levels. For example, an employment manager of Woodward and

Lothrop Department Stores is responsible for hiring employees ranging from stock clerks to managers of complete departments. Each of these employers was interviewed personally with Questionnaire I (See 4.3.2).

Second, forty-seven 11th grade male students from a high school in inner-city Washington, D.C. were given Questionnaire II (See 4.3.2) The overwhelming majority of teen-age respondents would be classified as either Upper or Lower working class according to the criteria used for informants in SES classification (See 4.3.1.2). Only males were chosen for this experiment since it is generally assumed that employability is a greater matter of concern for males than for females. In sum, these respondents typified the working class Negro teen-agers who will eventually be a major part of the urban job market.

4.3.3.2 Instructions

Instructions for Questionnaire I were, for all practical purposes, self explanatory. The test was administered on an individual basis.

For Questionnaire II, instructions were as follows:

INSTRUCTIONS FOR WASHINGTON, D.C. QUESTIONNAIRE II

Today we're going to see how much you can tell about a person just from the way he talks. You know how you can tell a lot about a person just from hearing him on the telephone. Well, this is the same sort of thing. Before we go on, however, please fill out the first page of the questionnaire, giving your age, grade, any plans about college, and the type of job you would like to have in the next few years.

Now on the tape we're going to listen to a number of different event, etc. We want your opinion on how this person's speech sounds to you. There are four parts to answer for each speaker.

In (a) we want your personal opinion as to whether the person sounds successful to you. As you listen to him speak, you will have some opinion as to whether or not he is a success in his job and

social contacts. If you think he sounds successful put a check in the box marked yes, if not, in the box marked no.

In (b), we want to know if you think his speech is acceptable to you. We want a personal opinion, not one you might have learned in school. There is no right or wrong to this question; this is just a personal opinion.

In (c) we want to know if this person talks the way your friends do. Choose between the three categories: all of your friends talk like he does; some of your friends talk like he does; none of your friends talk like he does.

In (d), we want to know what types of jobs this person might have based just on the way he speaks. In (d) it is possible to check more than one job. For example, you might think that the way the person speaks is like a college professor; than as you read on further you might think he also sounds like he might be a doctor or a newspaper reporter, etc. You may check as many jobs as you think fit this person's speech.

When you are finished, you will have one check for a, one for b, one for c and at least one for d. Each speech sample will be played twice. The first time you might just want to listen and get your first impression of how the speech sounds to you. When the passage is repeated you should fill out a, b, c, and d. In all there are 16 speech samples. Be sure to check the number you are filling with the number that is given on the tape before each sample.

Remember, each speech sample will be played twice, and you are to fill out a-d for each.

4.4 Results

This study was concerned with the evaluation of specific speech patterns in terms of employability.

The data in this study are based upon the responses of 16 employers and 47 11th grade male students.

The following scale was adopted for computing the responses for the 21 job categories:

Rank	Job Category
1.	doctor, college professor, architect
2.	junior manager, accountant, fire chief
3.	newspaper reporter, sales supervisor, drug store owner
4.	key punch operator, salesman, stock clerk
5.	mechanic, printer, policeman
6.	truck driver, gas station attendant, night watchman
7.	laborer, janitor, bus-boy

These results should be regarded as suggestive and promising rather than conclusive.

The results deal with 1) the ranking of employability of an individual based on a sample of his speech and 2) the correlation of employability with "acceptable" or "successful" speech.

4.4.1 Ranking of Employability

Is speech an important criterion for job opportunity?

Table 29 presents the employers' ranking of the teen-age and adult speech stimuli. The figures represent means on the seven point occupational scale.

TABLE 29

	Stimuli							
	I		II		III		IV	
	Adult	Teen-age	A	T	A	T	A	T
Employer Respondents	4.69	4.03	5.21	4.69	5.52	4.92	6.13	6.31
Actual Rating[1]	2.00	1.50	3.00	3.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	7.00

One will note in Table 29 that the speech of all social classes is rated on the lower end of the occupational scale. Even the speech of informants in SES I is rated as appropriate for occupations generally considered typical of SES III and IV.

However, within the lower end of the occupational scale there is a stratification of occupational levels. Generally teen-agers rate slightly higher (except for SES IV) than adults.

How do teen-agers evaluate specific speech patterns in relation to employers' expectations?

In Table 30 the comparison of employers and teen-age respondents is presented.

---

1 For the teen-agers the rating is based on the occupation of the head of the household.

In Table 30 the comparison of employers and teenage respondents is presented.

TABLE 30

COMPARISON OF EMPLOYERS' AND TEENAGERS' RANKING OF SPEECH

Respondents	I		II		III		IV	
	Adults	TA	Adults	TA	Adults	TA	Adults	TA
Employers	4.69	4.03	5.21	4.64	5.52	4.92	6.13	6.31
Students	4.91	4.78	5.62	4.82	6.22	5.91	6.47	6.11

Table 30 indicates that the teenagers' responses approximate the employers' responses although overall they rank them slightly lower.

4.4.2 The Correlation of Employability with "Successful" and "Acceptable" Speech

Do teenagers correlate "successful" speech with certain job opportunities?

Table 31 presents the data on job status and rating of speech as successful or unsuccessful.

TEENAGERS' RATING OF SPEECH RE SUCCESS AND JOB STATUS

	Job Status							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Σ
Successful	27	30	62	62	60	60	37	336
Unsuccessful	4	5	11	26	39	135	157	377
Σ	31	35		73	88	195	192	713

A chi square (x^2) analysis revealed a significant relationship (beyond .001) between "successful" speech and job status ($x^2 = 234.4$). Unsuccessful speech was more frequently rated lower on job status than was successful speech which was rated more frequently with higher job status.

Do teenagers correlate acceptable speech with certain job opportunities?

Table 32 indicates the relationship between ratings on acceptability measures and job classification.

TABLE 32

TEENAGERS' RATING OF SPEECH RE ACCEPTABILITY AND JOB STATUS

	Job Status							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Σ
Acceptable	29	27	59	67	72	87	64	405
Unacceptable	0	7	9	13	29	91	117	266
Σ	29	34	68	80	101	178	181	671

The data were subjected to a x^2 analysis. The analysis revealed a significant relationship (x^2 = 258.35 significant beyond .001). Acceptable speech was more frequently rated as higher on job status than was unacceptable speech.

Do teenagers correlate acceptable speech with successful speech?

Of the responses tabulated, 47.1% of the responses were rated as successful, however, 60.3% were rated as acceptable. Table 33 presents the data concerning the question as to the relationship of successful speech and acceptable speech.

TABLE 33

	Acceptable	Unacceptable	
Successful	276	47	323
Unsuccessful	135	243	378
	411	290	701

A chi square analysis (x^2) of the data indicated that overall there was a significant relationship between rating speech as successful and also as acceptable (x^2 = 182.4).

However, it is interesting to note here that 32.8% of the acceptable responses were considered unsuccessful as well.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Discussion of Results

This study has implications for several current sociolinguistic issues.

5.1.1 The Issue of Negro Speech

There has been considerable discussion among linguists as to whether or not it is possible to characterize a kind of speech as Negro Speech or, more recently, Black English. There are those who say that there is essentially no difference between the English used by Negroes and whites in certain parts of the South. Others say that there are clear differences in the South which contrast a creole origin of the speech of Negroes to the European origin of the whites. Still other linguists are less interested in the historical origins but point to synchronic differences between Negro and white speech. This investigation deals with the synchronic situation without ruling out the possibility of diachronic influences on the synchronic description.

It is clear from our results that the speech of Negroes and whites is consistently distinguished in Detroit, since the judges correctly identified Negro 80% of the time and white speakers 81.2% of the time from as little as 20 to 30 seconds of continuous speech. Furthermore, more in nine short stimuli of from three to five seconds each Negro speakers were identified correctly 70.1% of the time and whites 67.3% of the time.

What is particulary interesting about this information is that Negro judges did only slightly better than whites in identifying Negroes (3.8%) and whites did only slightly better than Negroes in judging white (7.2%). Age does not particularly increase ability to determine the race of a speaker.

Children, teenagers, and adults vary only 2.4% in their ability to identify Negro speakers. The socio-economic status of the listener - judges also seemed relatively unimportant in identifying Negro speakers. Upper-middle, lower-middle, upper-working, and lower-working groups varied only 2.3% in identifying Negroes. Upper-middle class judges are only slightly better than the other socio-economic groups in identifying white speakers but the total range of variation is only 10.4% between all four groups of judges in identifying whites.

From these data, it seems relatively clear that Detroiters of all ages do extremely well in identifying the race of the speaker. Frequently it had been suggested that there is no such thing as Negro speech and that it is unfair to speak of the Negro nonstandard English. The evidence of this research makes it rather clear that in Detroit, regardless of the age, race, sex or socio-economic status of the listener, Negro identity of taped speakers can be made accurately from a minimum of 74.4% (adult white females) to a maximum of 86.2% (adult Negro females) of the time (See Table 8). From this it appears that there is a clear polarization in Detroit (and probably elsewhere) which enables residents there to think accurately along the lines of race with respect to the speech of their city. One might suggest that further research must now determine the extent to which Southern whites and Negroes can identify the race of speakers.

5.1.2 The Issue of Social Markedness

The most significant results of our research into the ability of a listener to correctly identify the socio-economic status of Detroiters is that the lower the socio-economic status the more accurate the identifications. All respondents identified upper-middle class speakers accurately only 29.6% of the time, lower middle class speakers 31.8% of the time, upper working class speakers

40.8% of the time and lower working class speakers a whopping 60.8% of the time. Negroes are generally more accurate in assigning socio-economic status than whites at working class levels. Teenagers and adults are considerably more accurate in identifying socio-economic status than sixth grade children, especially at the lower levels, while upper-middle class respondents are generally best at identifying all four socio-economic groups.

When the identification of both race and socio-economic status of the taped recorded speakers are examined, it is clear that the lower the socio-economic status, the more accurately Negroes are identified, whereas for whites, the higher the socio-economic status the more accurately they are identified. Of particular interest here is the fact that Negro upper-middle class speakers were identified accurately by Negroes 17.8% and by whites only 8.2%.

These data have several important things to say to students of language. It seems clear, for example, that the most outstanding fact in the differentiation of social dialects in Detroit is the presence of "stigmatized" grammatical and phonological features in the speech of lower SES groups. The speech of the middle class is typified by the absence of these features. This is not to say that there are no "prestigious" features in the speech of middle class informants. Indeed, objective research (Fasold 1968) does indicate the presence of certain prestigious forms. But since this study reveals that it is easier to accurately identify a lower class than a middle class speaker, one can conclude that prestigious features of the middle class are not nearly as obtrusive as the stigmatized features of the working class. One may say that the speech of the working class is socially marked and the speech of the middle class socially unmarked.

It is of further interest to note that the social markedness of speech clusters in different ways across race. Social markedness of Negro speech is distributed so that N I speakers are distinguished from N II, III and IV and N II and III speakers are distinguished from N IV. SES I and II white speakers, on the other hand, are distinguished from SES III (See 5.5).

5.1.3 The Issue of Popular Judgments Regarding Dialects

In a search for a terminology by which language judgments can be made meaningfully by laymen, the semantic differential scale proved interesting though not always useful. Detroiters of all types seem rather neutral about the speech of their city. Unlike some cities, such as New York, there appears to be no distinct entity conceived of as Detroit Speech by Detroiters. On the other hand, it is worth noting that the higher the SES of the judge, the higher he values British Speech. This concept, however, is neutral or meaningless to lower SES groups.

These data support previous research in which it was suggested that Negroes regarded white Southern Speech more negatively than did whites and whites regarded Negro Speech more perjoratively than did Negroes (Lambert 1960). What is of more interest, however, is that whites saw less difference between Southern Speech and Negro Speech than did Negroes. Negroes see Negro Speech and Detroit Speech about the same, whereas whites see Negro Speech and Detroit Speech as distinct. Both Negroes and whites judge Detroit Speech the same. This would suggest that both Negroes and whites consider these speech patterns as Detroit Speech.

This exploration into subjective reactions to speech concepts may be regarded as an interesting step toward understanding a broader spectrum of language in society than is provided by either the ojbective use of language or the judgmental reactions from a tape recorded stimulus. Further investi-

gation into other speech concepts is in order and longevity studies of such concepts as Negro Speech may be quite revealing of a changing social climate.

5.1.4 The Issue of Using the Semantic Differential Scale

On the basis of this exploratory use of the semantic differential scale in response to speech samples and language concepts, it is clear that this can be a useful tool to compensate for the general inarticulateness of the public in evaluating speech. On the correct - incorrect scale which accompanied the speech samples, for example, the judgments of all subjects stratify quite neatly according to socio-economic status. SES I $\bar{M}$ = 2.86, SES II $\bar{M}$ = 3.85, SES III $\bar{M}$ = 4.93, SES IV $\bar{M}$ = 5.71.

It appears that semantic differential responses to speech samples stratify in ways that would suggest value judgments being placed on those linguistic features which are used to identify race and SES. This reaction is also seen in response to other scales. Some scales are apparently more meaningful to judges concerning their subjective reaction to language concepts. For example it appears that generally the thick - thin scale does not elicit this kind of stratification. It would appear that further research might suggest scales that are more relevant to individuals' judgments concerning language.

Our pre-testing indicated that the semantic differential response to speech samples could not be used in this experiment with working class respondents without interfering with their performance on the other tasks presented. However, middle class sixth grade children use the semantic differential scale as well as eleventh graders or adults. The responses of sixth grade children were not essentially different from other subjects on the correct-incorrect, graceful-awkward, tense-relaxed or thick-thin scales. There is adequate evidence here to suggest that the semantic differential

scale can be used with children as early as the sixth grade in language judgment experiments.

When the semantic differential scale was used in connection with speech concepts, sixth graders seemed to be as competent as teenagers on the evaluative scales but they responded differently on the presumed potency scales. This suggests that the technique can be useful with sixth grade children as long as evaluative scales are used.

5.1.5 The Issue of Correlating Objective and Subjective Language Data

Having investigated the subjective reactions of respondents to speech samples, we may now ask how these facts compare with the objective socio-linguistic analysis of speech. In the first place, we observe that the subjective reactions to the racial identity of the speaker fit the evidence of objective studies which conclude that, at least in Northern cities, there is a qualitative difference between the speech of most Negroes and the speech of whites (See Wolfram forthcoming).

As far as the identification of the social classes is concerned, there are several important relation between the subjective reactions and the objective data. The objective data for Detroit, show that there is very little difference between the speech of SES I and SES II whites. But there is a clear demarcation between the speech of SES II whites and SES III whites. The subjective reactions indicate that respondents similarly have a difficult time differentiating between SES I and II whites, but generally distinguish between SES II and III.

For the Negroes, the subjective reactions to the SES of the speaker on the correct/incorrect scale (See Table 19) indicate that SES I is regarded quite different from SES II and III, which are considered quite similar. SES I is considered relatively neutral but SES II and III are con-

sidered somewhat incorrect. In the actual speech samples SES I and II are differentiated by phonological features and SES groups I and II are differentiated from III and IV on the basis of both phonology and grammar. It is therefore interesting to note that in the subjective reactions SES I was distinguished from SES II and III which were seen as quite similar. Thus the grammatical differences between II and III were obviously overlooked in favor of the phonological features differentiating I and II. On the basis, one may suggest that a Negro speaker who retains certain phonological features indicating racial identity will be considered on the same level with the speaker having marked grammatical and phonological features.

5.1.6 The Issue of Language and Employability

The data on employers' rating of speech (See Table 29) indicate that employers do judge potential employees on the basis of speech. In the classification of speech as it relates to possible job opportunities, however, the employers consistently rate the speech as appropriate for a lower level jobs than the actual employment level of the speaker.

The comparison of working class teenagers' responses with the employers' responses reveals that the rating of both are quite similar. In fact, the teenage male respondents tend to rate the occupational levels of speakers slightly lower than the employers. This finding suggests that, contrary to popular beliefs, these teenagers can adequately classify the appropriateness of speech as it relates to job opportunity. Furthermore, the teenagers do correlate the concept of "successful" and "acceptable" speech with opportunity.

5.2 Limitations of this Study

Several problems in research procedures deserve further consideration in future studies of this nature.

5.2.1 Problems of SES Classification

The SES classification used in this study was a system originally designed for the Detroit Language Study (Shuy, Wolfram, Riley, 1967). Both the Detroit study and the present study indicated that speech markers characterizing the SES groups are different in white and Negro communities. The data suggest that the present classification system may not be applicable for both the Negroes and whites since the social boundaries between classes are different for the respective communities. A different scale may have to be devised if we wish to describe behavior of Negro and white.

5.2.2 Difficulties in Constructing the Semantic Differential

For this study already existing scales with presumed evaluation, activity or potency ratings were chosen. It would appear that some of these scales do not seem to be relevant (i.e. thick-thin) when judging oral speech samples and speech concepts.

5.2.3 Statistical Procedures

No statistical analyses of significance were calculated on the data concerning identification of race and SES and on the data involving the semantic differential. Although 620 Ss were used in this experiment, percentage and mean comparisons were some times based on smaller cells (i.e. - 30 Negro male teenagers).

The results here can only be considered as highly suggestive. Further statistical analyses may allow for more definite conclusions.

5.3 Implications for Further Research

This project should be viewed as a beginning step towards defining the variables that identify the speech of individuals from varied backgrounds. It is also a preliminary step towards understanding the relationship of speech behavior to economic opportunity.

5.3.1 Examination of the Generalizability of this Research

In the first place, the extent to which the subjective reactions to speech in Detroit are typical of larger Northern cities must be examined. Secondly, similar types of studies should be conducted in the South. Studies in the south concerning race and SES identification may shed considerable light on the similarities and difference in white Southern and Negro speech.

5.3.2 Pedagogical Applications

If Standard English is to be taught in the classroom it appears, from this research, that one should investigate further with the students what kind of Standard English that should be. In addition, there should be a more thorough investigation of the speech that these teenagers rate as acceptable but unsuccessful and those rated as unacceptable and unsuccessful. The differences in the speech of individuals in those two ratings may give clues to those speech characteristics which teenagers admire and which should not be presented in initial contrastive drills in teaching Standard English.

5.3.3 Expansion of the Semantic Differential

The findings in this study indicated that the semantic differential can be a useful tool in helping people present their feelings about speech behavior. However, it appears that considerable work has to be done in determining what scales would be valid indicators for reacting to speech samples and concepts.

5.3.4 Language Attitudes as Related to Prejudice

This study has indicated that speech behavior is a marker of racial and SES groups. Further investigations could investigate the relationship of attitudes towards Negroes and identification rating of Negro speech.

6.1 Appendix A: A review of the literature on linguistic correlates of social stratification.[1]

1.3.1 The Social Stratification of Linguistic Variables

It is from the field of dialectology that the earliest modern attempts to account for social variation in speech can be cited. American dialectologists recognized that social differences had to be considered even though the primary goal of dialect geography was the correlation of settlement history with regional varieties of English. Kurath, for example, in directing the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada, was aware that social differences intersected with settlement history and geographical difference to account for linguistic variation. As reported in the Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England, Linguistic Atlas fieldworkers divided informants into three main types as follows:

> Type I: Little formal education, little reading and restricted social contacts.
> Type II: Better formal education (usually high school) and/or wider reading and social contacts.
> Type III: Superior education (usually college), cultured background, wide reading and/or extensive social contacts (Kurath 1939: 44).

In addition, each of the above types was subdivided as:

> Type A: Aged, and/or regarded by the fieldworker as old-fashioned.
> Type B: Middle-aged or younger, and/or regarded by the fieldworker as more modern (Kurath 1939: 44).

[1] This review is taken from the thesis, "Linguistic Correlates of Social Stratification in the Speech of Detroit Negroes" by Walter Wolfram. Mr. Wolfram's thesis will be published in the Urban Language Series of the Center for Applied

Although different social types were recognized in the work of the Linguistic Atlas, several difficulties were apparent because the social parameter was not adequately considered. The social classification of informants was dependent on the fieldworkers' subjective impressions. The vagueness with which the social types were profiled (e.g. "little reading and restricted social contacts") caused the social classification of informants to be unreliable. Furthermore, no verifiable sociological model for rating the social status of informants was utilized. Education, which seemed to be primary in the evaluation of informants, is only one of the various factors which is used by social scientists in rating social status.

Whereas the correlation of social with linguistic differences was of secondary concern in the work of the Linguistic Atlas (Kurath, 1941, 1949), later interpretation of the Linguistic Atlas data gave more direct attention to the importance of social factors in accounting for linguistic diversity. Dialectologists, however, still seemed to appeal to the social parameter only when "data proved too complicated to be explained by merely a geographical statement or a statement of settlement history" (McDavid 1948: 194). Thus, McDavid's "Postvocalic -r in South Carolina: A Social Analysis" (1948) amends a geographical explanation of post-vocalic-r in the Piedmont area of South Carolina by analyzing the intersection of social class with geographical differences. A recent treatment of the social parameter in describing a speech community by a dialectologist can be found in Pederson's (1965) description of English phonology in Chicago.

From a differing viewpoint, anthropologists have made significant contributions to the study of linguistic correlates of social stratification in the last decade. Whereas dialectologists have been satisfied with rough approximations of social divisions to which linguistic phenomena may be related, anthropologists have characteristically been rigorous in their differentiation of social groups. Independent ethnographical description of behavioral patterns characterizing different social strata is required before any correlation of linguistic variables to these strata can be made. Research on the social stratification of linguistic features has been pioneered by Gumperz (1958a; 1958b; 1961; 1964), Hymes (1961; 1964), and Bright (1960; 1964; 1966). Gumperz, in several articles (1958a, 1958b), has shown how linguistic variables, particularly phonological variables, relate to the caste systems of India. Southeastern Asia, perhaps because of its rigid stratification between castes, has received the most extensive consideration by anthropologists. Anthropological linguists such as Hymes (1961; 1964) and Ervin-Tripp (1964) have concerned themselves with developing a structural taxonomy of the factors which must be dealt with from a sociolinguistic perspective of verbal behavior. For example, Ervin-Tripp (1964) suggests that settings, participants, topics, and functions of interaction all must be considered from a sociolinguistic perspective of speech. Little consideration has been given to American English by anthropologists, although Fisher (1958) provided an analysis of the morphemic variation

between the suffixal participle -_En_ and -_I_ in English by considering the social background of 24 children in a New England town.

The contributions of sociologists to the social stratification of linguistic variables, until recently, have been minimal. Labov (1966a: 23) notes that "psychologists and sociologists have lacked the linguistic training required to isolate particular elements of language structure and have worked primarily with vocabulary and content analysis". Sociologists have made their most significant contribution in demanding valid methods of research design and sampling. Pickford (1956), for example, notes the errors of "reliability" and "validity" which characterize the work of the Linguistic Atlas. Research design and sampling techniques in current sociolinguistic work have profited mainly from the insights of sociologists. Recent interest by sociologists in the linguistic parameter is evidenced by a volume of _Sociological Inquiry_ (1966) dedicated to explorations in sociolinguistics. The research of Bernstein (1960; 1961; 1964; 1966) and Levine and Crockett (1966; 1967) is relevant to current work on the social stratification of linguistic variables.

It was Labov's work on the social stratification of English in New York City (1964a; 1964b; 1965; 1966a; 1966b; 1966c) more than any other research, that combined the insights of linguistics and sociology. Using a survey by the Mobilization for Youth as his sociological model, he analyzed the speech of over a hundred, randomly selected informants. Five different phonological variables (_oh_, _eh_, _r_, _th_, _dh_), isolated in

four contextual styles (careful speech, casual speech, reading, word lists) were correlated to the social stratification of the informants. Labov made several major contributions to the study of linguistic correlates of social stratification. In the first place, he used sociologically valid procedures in selecting the informants for his sample. Many linguists prior to Labov were largely satisfied with biased, non-random informant selection. Also, Labov's quantitative measurement of linguistic variables, although not the first, was considerably more extensive than any previous sociolinguistic research. Further, his effort to isolate contextual styles on the basis of extra-linguistic "channel cues" was a careful attempt to define interview styles in linguistics. The major contribution of Labov was his demonstration that speech differences within a community, often dismissed by linguists as "free variation", systematically correlated with social differences.

The Detroit Dialect Study (Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1967), from which the corpus for this research is taken, experimented with several different methods of analyzing speech differences. It extended the insights of Labov on the linguistic variable to grammatical as well as phonological variables. An attempt to measure differences by the quantitative measurement of structural types (e.g. clause and phrase types) was also investigated.

The present study enlarges the sociolinguistic description of Detroit speech in several ways. Based on preliminary research by Shuy, Wolfram and Riley (1967), it expands the correlation of linguistic with

social variables. Only two grammatical (multiple negation and pronominal apposition) and one phonological (syllable final nasal) variable were investigated in the original study. This study expands the investigation to four phonological and four grammatical variables. In addition, it investigates the relationship between socially diagnostic phonological and grammatical variables. Furthermore, the selection of linguistic variables in the original study was restricted to those which were socially diagnostic for both the Negro and white community. In this study, several variables which are applicable only to the Negro community are investigated. Finally, the selection of informants in this study is more rigid than the original study. Informants for the preliminary study were disproportionately distributed in the different social classes. This meant that several social classes were not adequately represented. But this study is designed so that informants are evenly distributed in each of the four social classes represented (see Section 1.4.1).

1.3.2 The Systematic Study of Nonstandard Negro English

Although the speech of American Negroes has frequently been represented in folk literature, until recently it has received little attention from linguists. On the one hand, this lack of attention can be attributed to the attitude that nonstandard speech is less worthy of interest than the study of socially acceptable varieties of English. On the other hand, the disregard for nonstandard Negro English is due to the fact that scholars of the English language have often stressed the identity of Negro and uneducated white southern speech.

For the most part, it was dialectologists who concluded that nonstandard Negro English was not essentially different from the speech of southern whites of comparable socio-economic levels. Thus Kurath, in A Word Geography of the Eastern United States (1949: 6), notes:

> By and large the Southern Negro speaks the language of the white man of his locality or area and of his education. ...As far as the speech of the uneducated Negroes is concerned, it differs little from that of the illiterate white; that is, it exhibits the same regional and local variations as that of the simple white folk.

Raven I. McDavid, presently an influential American dialectologist, has reinforced Kurath's position:

> With our current knowledge it is safest to assume that the range of variants is the same in Negro and in white speech, though the statistical distribution of variants has been skewed by the American caste system (1965: 258).

Even studies conducted only with Negro informants assumed the same position. Juanita Williamson, in A Phonological and Morphological Study of the Speech of the Negro of Memphis, Tennessee (1961: 1) maintains:

> It is generally recognized by linguists that the speech of the Negro is not a "distinct entity" and does not differ materially from that of whites of the area in which he has lived the greater part of his life.

One exception to the identity of white Southern and Negro dialects has been recognized by dialectologists, namely, Gullah or Geechee, spoken along the coasts of South Carolina and Georgia. Gullah is

generally considered to be an English-based creole even by dialectologists (McDavid and McDavid 1951: 6). Dialectologists have considered this creole to be an anomaly among other nonstandard Negro dialects (McDavid 1963: 476).

The recognition that Negro dialects other than Gullah must be considered systematically different from white dialects can be largely attributed to the work of such creole specialists as Stewart (1964a; 1964b; 1967; 1968) Dillard (1967; 1968), and Bailey (1965; 1968). These have maintained that present-day Negro dialects are derived, not from British dialects as dialectologists have assumed, but from a creole variety of English which was spoken by the earliest slaves.[5] Stewart notes:

> Of those Africans who fell victim to the Atlantic slave trade and were brought to the New World, many found it necessary to learn some kind of English. With very few exceptions, the form of English they acquired was a pidginized one, and this kind of English became so well established as the principal medium of communication between Negro slaves in the British colonies that it was passed on as a creole language to succeeding generations of the New World Negroes for whom it was their native tongue (1967: 22).

Present-day Negro dialect has resulted from a process which Stewart labels "decreolization" (i.e. the loss of creole features).

---

5 Prior to creolist interpretations, there had been occasional reference to the existence of qualitative differences between Southern white and Negro nonstandard features. For example, Wise (1957: 297-302) distinguishes "specific features of substandard Southern Negro speech" from "features of substandard Negro speech held in common with substandard Southern white speech".

Through contact with the British-derived dialects the creole variety of English spoken by Negroes merged with other dialects of English. The merging process, however, was neither instantaneous nor complete. Stewart asserts:

> Indeed, the non-standard speech of present-day American Negroes still seems to exhibit structural traces of a creole predecessor, and this is probably a reason why it is in some ways more deviant from standard English than is the non-standard speech of even the most uneducated American whites (1968: 3).

Stewart substantiates his claim that Negro dialects derived from a widespread slave creole by examining the close relationship which is found between 18th and 19th century Negro dialect and other New World creoles (Stewart 1967).

The above discussion clearly indicates that the creolist perspective on Negro dialect has come into sharp conflict with dialectology's traditional view of white Southern and Negro dialect differences. What, then, can account for this sharp difference of opinion? One explanation is that dialectologists have focused their attention on the similarities between nonstandard Negro dialects and white dialects, whereas creolists have focused on the differences between these two varieties of English. Dialectologists have been largely occupied with phonological and lexical differences, the levels on which the dialects are nearly (but not completely) alike. Creolists, on the other hand, have concerned themselves with subtle differences between grammatical categories.

The most serious consequence of the creolist position seems to be that many of the differences between the dialects are viewed as "deep structure" differences.[6] Thus, Bailey, in "Toward a New Perspective in Negro English Dialectology" (1965a: 172) remarks:

> I would like to suggest that the Southern Negro "dialect" differs from other Southern speech because its deep structure is different, having its origins as it undoubtably does in some Proto-Creole grammatical structure.

At this point in the research of Nonstandard Negro English (henceforth abbreviated NNE), the question of the historical relationship between NNE and white dialects has not been satisfactorily answered. Only additional investigation of NNE as a system in itself and as a system which shows both similarities and differences with other varieties of English will resolve the controversy.

Linguists not accepting the creolist historical interpretation (or, as descriptivists, uninterested in the historical derivation of NNE) have now taken up the systematic description of Negro dialects. Views concerning the significance of the differences between NNE and white dialects vary drastically. Loflin, for example, maintains that:

> Efforts to construct a grammar for Nonstandard Negro English suggest that the similarities between it and Standard English are superficial. There is every reason, at

---

6 "Deep structure" has been used traditionally to refer to the "base component" in a transformational-generative view of language. From the viewpoint of Stratificational grammar, it is interpreted to refer to the lexemic Stratum (See Taber 1966: 63).

> this state of research to believe that a fuller description of Nonstandard Negro English will show a grammatical system which must be treated as a foreign language (1967a: 1312).

Other linguists have recognized systematic differences between white and Negro dialects, but have seen the differences to be of minor rather than major significance. Labov and Cohen suggest:

> ...The general indication of our work so far is that the differences between this dialect and standard English are greater on the surface than in the underlying grammatical structure (1967: 66).

Still others, such as Fasold (forthcoming), have taken a moderate view:

> Since we are dealing with two dialects of the same language, it seems likely that the differences we find will be relatively small ones. However, this by no means implies that they are of little consequence. Some of these differences involve the deepest level of language, that of possible message. In other words, it can be shown that there are messages possible in Black English which are not possible in Standard English and vice-versa.

The views of Labov, Loflin, and Fasold indicate the wide range of opinions held concerning the significance of the differences between NNE and white dialects. Nevertheless, these scholars essentially agree (and in this they unite with the creolists) in their insistence that systematic differences must be recognized between the NNE and other varieties of English.

Since systematic differences between NNE and other dialects of English have only been recognized in the last several years, there are

few available descriptions of NNE. Loflin, in several articles (1967a; 1967b), has focused on the verb system, maintaining the dominance of aspect over tense and the unique nature of the *be* copula in NNE. Somewhat differing interpretations of *be* have been offered by Fasold (forthcoming), Feigenbaum (forthcoming) and Labov, et al (1968). Labov, et al (1965a; 1967; 1968) have done preliminary analysis of both grammar and phonology, with emphasis on the latter. Recently, Labov (1968) has suggested that the absence of the copula (e.g. *he nice* 'he is nice') can be accounted for by extending the contraction rules of standard English (henceforth abbreviated as SE) to cover what he considers "deletion" of copula in NNE. Meanwhile, Loman (1967a) has studied intonation and made available a series of texts for analysis (1967b).

Currently, the most concentrated research on NNE is being conducted in New York City by William Labov and associates (1965; 1968) and in Washington, D.C. by the staff of the Sociolinguistics Program under the direction of Roger W. Shuy at the Center for Applied Linguistics. The present study expands research on the structure of NNE in two ways. First, several NNE features which have not been investigated previously are described. Second, it serves as a basis for comparing the structure of NNE in several different cities.

6.2 Appendix B: Tape Typescripts

Sample

fə meykIŋ tents wiy yuwstə gɛt ðIs ənʊliyč kʰʊtɪ̈n /
æn wiyd teyk pærɪ̈fiyn ˈʊlʊ̈ks ə pærfiyn æn wɪ̈tə wɔrm ʊ̈n
jɪ̈s prɛs It rʊ̈yt Intə ðə ə klɔð /
æn ðæt wotɪ̈ pruwft It fɔr əs /
æn fɔr hɛvI næfrə nʊ̈yt næp sæks ə ɪ̈n θIŋz lʊ̈yk ðæt wiy
yuwstə yuwz æn Indyən freym /

For making tents we used to get this unbleach cotton. And we'd take parafin, blocks of parafin and with a worm iron just press it right into the ahh cloth. And that waterproofed it for us. And for heavy nafra night, napsacks ahh and things like that, we used to use an Indian frame.

1. ay jɪ̈s lʊk æt It sʊ̈m tam æn nən sʊ̈mtam a ˈbiy ˈbɪ̈zɪ̈ /
a jɪ̈s hæf lʊk æt It /
ay nɛvə hʊ̈dlI lʊk ɪ̈t wən ɔlə wey ʊ̈ruw /
ay nɛvər fawn wən nə wəz tuw mɛ̈č əvə feyvrɪ̈t /
wiy yɪ̈stə gowtə θiyeytər əlʊt čɪ̈ now /
wɛl It ɔl ˈʊlənz In nə seym θIŋ lʊ̈yk ðæt /
ɪ̈n ə gʊ̈y jɪ̈s lʊk æt ɪ̈ sow ɔftən wɛl yuw down kɛr tuw mɛ̈č
əbʊ̈t ɪ̈t /

I just look at it some time and then sometime I be busy. I just half look at it. I never hardly look at one all the way through. I never found one that was too much of a favorite. We used to go(to) the theater alot you know. Well it all blends in the same thing like that. And a guy just look at it so often well you don't care too much about it.

2. pleyd ˈbɑskɪtbɔl kwɑyt ə ˈbɪt /
ɑy ə owɛyz plˈeyd gˈɜrd /
ɑy wɛz nɛver ə riyl gʊd skorər ɑy wɛz ˈbɛtər frɔm ðiy ɑʊtsɑʊyd/
ɑy ǰɛs suwn gɛt ðə ˈbɔrdz ɜn pæs of tuw mɑy tiym mImbər In stɛd
əv duwɜn mowstə ðə šuwtɪŋ /
ˈbət ə ay hævən pleyd bˈɛskɪtbɔl ˈbiykɛz Its ə ɑy pleyd ɛgɛns
ðə hɑy skuwl hɪr ɛkɛpɪl yIrz ɛgow ɜn ɑy θɛt ɑyɛz gˈɛnə day
əʊavt sIks tɑymz ɛp ðə flɔr /

Played ˈbasketball quite a ˈbit. I ahh always played guard. I was never a real good scorer, I was ˈbetter from the outside. I just soon got the ˈboards and pass off to my team member instead of doing most of the shooting. But ahh I haven't played ˈbasketball because it's ahh, I played against the high school here a couple years ago and I thought I was gonna die about six times up the floor.

3. dæt wɛz ə ˈblan gɜrl lIvIŋ wɪɜ hɪr mɛðə a ˈbliyv /
æn šiy wʊt gow vIzɪt ðə pˈɑrk ɛvrɪ dey /
æn wɑyl šiy wɛz ɛr šiy mɛt ə ðIs yəŋ mæn /
æn ðey bˈɛkeym gʊd frɛnz /
æn wɛl hiy ɛftɪ ə wɑyl hiy wənt tI trɑy ɜn hɛp ɜr / .
sow hiy stˈɑrt InvɑytIŋ hɪr owvɪ tu hIz ɛpˈɑrtmɛnt /
ɜn wɛl ðey diyvɛlɛpt kwɑyt ə klows frɛnšIp /

That was a ˈblind girl living with her mother I believe. And she would go visit the park everyday. And while she was there she met ahh this young man. And they became good friends. And well he, after awhile he want to try and help her. So he start inviting her over to his apartment. And well they developed quite a close friendship.

4. wɛl yuwd hæv ə sʌmbɔdɪ huw meybiy ɛriy or for fɛlɛz wɪt strɔŋ bʌks/

æn ðey wud liyn əgɪns ðə wɛl /

æn ðɛn θriy ə for fɛlɛz yuw now ðə seym nʌmbə ɑn iyɛ saʊyd wud ǰʌmp on ðiyz fɛlɛz bʌks /

æn ðeyd sey bʌk bʌk haw mɛnɪ fɪŋgz ʌp /

æn lɛts sey fɚr ɛgzæmpɪl ow puta θriy æn ðə pɚsɛn wud sey yuw now ɪn nə frɛnt sey θriy /

Well you'd have ahh somebody who mayBe three or four fellas with strong backs. And they would lean against the wall. And then three or four fellas, you know, the same number on each side would jump on these fellas backs. And they'd say "Buk, buk how many fingers up. And lets say for example oh put up three, and the person would say, you know, in the front say "three.

5. durɪŋ ə sʌmɚ wiyd gow ɑwt ɪn lɪv wɪθ mɑy mɛbɛz rɛlɛtɪvz ɔn ðə fɔrm /

æn ə mɑy ʌnkɚl yuwžlɪ /

ðɛn ðeyd hæv ə fowl kʌm ɪn/

stey ðɛr ə ɪn ǰɚs əbɑwt tam wiy ə ðɪ kowlt wɛz strɔŋ ɪnɛf fə ɛs tə rad It biy tam tə gow bʌk /

bɛt wiy wud rayd ðə hɔsɚz /

ɪn ney hæd muwlz ðɛr/

ɪn kɛpɚlə dʊkɪz ɑwt ðɛr/

æn ðey hæd ʧɪkɛn ɔlsow ɛxt ðey yuwz fə plawɚn /

5. (continued)

During the summer we'd go out and live with my mother's relatives on the farm. And ahh my uncle, usually. Then they'd have a fold come in. Stay there ahh and just about time we ahh, the colt was strong enough for us to ride, it be time to go back. But we would ride the horses. And they had mules there. And couple donkeys out there. And they had oxen also that they use for plowing.

6. nə gy down wənt now liydɪ̃r /

ðə liydɪ̃rz wiy gʊt down miyn nəʊɪ̃n /

wɪ̃n wɪ̃nə mən gets ɛp tə pəzIšɪ̃n yɪ̃ now lʊyk hiy lʊyk hiy

gIts tɪ̃ biy ə liydɪ̃r ðarz səmðIn ðat hæ hæpənz tɪ̃əm /

hiy čeynǰɪ̃z /

hiy kɪ̃n biy ðə nows gʊ̈d flrIŋ mən yʊ̈v siym/

hiy ǰɛs čeynǰɪ̃z /

No, I don't want no leader. The leaders we got don't mean nothin. When when a man gets up to position you know, like he like he gets to be a leader, there's something that ha' happens to him. He changes. He can be the most God-fearing man you've seen. He just changes.

7. ə mənə ə In naytiym fətI nan ə IndestrI wəntId də muwv dahn nɑh /

bət dI bInIs liydɪ̃z dey dIn wən It tə kəm In /

dɪ̃n ney kʊdən gIt nowɫədI /

kɔs ə pɛ̃rsɪ̃n down nɛvə gIt tuw owl lə lɪ̃rn bət dæt dæt wəz

də də wey dey siym lʊyf /

bət bə yəɹɪ̃ ǰənɪteyšɪ̃n ɹz zey skuwl lɛm rIgʊdlɪ̃s ə wət dey dey

biy towl ðey kɪ̃n siy fə ðeyself /

7. (continued)

I member ahh in nineteen forty-nine ahh industry wanted to move down there. But the business leaders they didn't want it to come in. Then they couldn't get nobody. Cause a person don't never get too old to learn but that, that was the, the way they seen life. But the younger generation as they school them, regardless of what they, they be told, they can see for theyself.

8. ə ə yəŋstɚr In ðə sIntɚr wʊd seɣ pʊm pʊm pʊlɛwey gɛč yɚr hors ɚn rənəwey /

æn wIn niy sɛz zæt ðɛn evrI wɛn wʊd hefte rɛn owvɚ tu ðI oðɚ sʊyd /

æn ðIs kId wʊd tæg sʊm wɛn/

æn wIn niy tægz ɚm ðɛn ə ðæt pɚrsɚn wʊd hafte stey In ðə sʊnɚ ə striyt /

æn yuw kʊd siy æz ţu ə æz yuw wɛnt ɔn mor ɔn mor wʊd gɛt Intə ðə sʊnɚ də striyt /

æn Id biykʌm mor ɚn mor dIfɛkəlt for ðowz ɔn ðiy ədə sʊyd tə gɛt ekros /

A youngster in the center would say " pom, pom pullaway get you horse and run away. And when he says that, then everyone would hafta run over to the other side. And this kid would tag some one. And when he tags him then ahh that person would hafta stay in the center of (the) street. And you could see as to ahh, as you went on more and more would get into the center of the street. And it'd become more and more difficult for those on the other side to get across.

Tape Transcription

1. ðə wəz əbawt ðiy pliysmən from fɪlədɛlfiyə
ey hʊmɪsayd ə dɪtɛktɪv /
ɜn iy stɑpt owvər In ə lɪtəl sʌðərn town/
wən ə ðiy dɛpyɜtiyz əv ðə town soh ðɪs ə pliysmɜn sɪtiyŋ
In ðiy ə steyšɜn /
æn sow ðiy dɛpyɜtiy ərɛstɜd ɜn kəz
bɪkəz hiy θɔt ðət hiy wəz ðiy mɜrdərɜr əv ðɪs mən
huw æd ɔlsow bən rɑðɜr wɪz rɑðɜr welθiy /
æn ðey fɑʊnd awt leytɜr ðət ə
hiy wɪz əkšliy ə hʊmɪsayd dɜtɛktɪv
wɪč wəz rɑðɜr Imbərəsiyŋ /

That was about the policeman from Philadelphia, a homocide ah detective. And he stopped over in a little southern town. One of the deputies of the town saw this ahh policeman sitting in the ahh station. And so the deputy arrested him cause, because he thought that he was the murderer of this man who had also been rather, was rather wealthy. And they found out later that ahh he was actually a homocide detective which was rather embarrassing.

2. wɪl ah yuws ə šuwt mʊhɜɪlɪ/
wən θiyŋ meyk ə lɪl rahn riyŋ siy /
æn tuw wəz yuw bət fahv mʊhbɜɪlɪz sɛmɜm lʊyk ət /
ɛvɜ wən yuw nʊk awt dɪs yohɪ yɪə yə gət nʊk ɜt kɪəyr awt də riyŋ siy /
nə ləs mʊhbɜɪl In nɛh yuw pʊt dət own nɛ own dɛ əǰ ə də riyŋ /
yə stɑn ɔp /

2. (continued)

If yə hIt dæt wʊn dən yuw šuwt æt də æt yɚ bədIz hIz mʊhbɚl hIz mʊhbɚl /

dIn yuw wIn ol hIz mʊhbɚl hiy gʊt /

kænt bId now lɛs ɪn wɛh sʊm piypəl pley tuw /

dæs də wey dæt gow /

Well I used to shoot marbles. One thing make a lil' round ring see. And two was you bet five marbles, something like that. Every one you knock out that's yours, but you got knock it clear out the ring see. The last marble in there you put that on the, on the edge of the ring. You stand up. If you hit that one then you shoot at the, at your buddy's, his marble, his marble. Then you win all his marble he got. Can't bid no less than, well, some people play two. That's the way that go.

3. ðIs gʊy hæd stowlən tuw ətʊmIk bʊmz yə now /

æn hiy ə wɚz trʊynə blɛkmeyl lə wɚl/

hiy sɛd hiy dImændɛd tuw mIlyɚn dʊlɚz ɚr sow ( ) hiy wʊd dIstroy

də wɚl /

sow I wəz ɔp tə ǰeymz bʊn də fʊynd ɛm yɚn æn dIstroy də bʊn /

dIn ɛm dIs gʊyz ə mIn ə trʊynə dIstroy bʊn yə now /

æn sow ol ɛv ə sedɚn hiy pušɚz hIz lɚl siykrɚt bətən ə sʊmpəm

stuwpIt lʊyk dæt /

æn ol liyə gʊyz bɛhl ʊwt ə də skʊy yɚ now Intuw də wɔtɚr /

ol liyz frʊg mIn Is ə greyt ændɚ wɛhtɚ bætɚl /

fʊndlI hiy rɛskuw də bʊmz ɛn ǰeymz bʊnd seylz ɔf Intuw də iys

wɚf ə byuwtIfɚl gɚrl /

3. (continued)

This guy had stolen two atomic bombs you know. And he ahh was trying to blackmail the world. He said, he demanded two million dollars or so ( ) he would destroy the world. So it was up to James Bond to find,ahhm ya,and destroy the bomb. Then ahhm this guys, ahh men, ahh trying to destroy Bond, you know. And so all of a sudden he pushes his lil' secret button or something stupid like that. And all these guys bail out of the sky, you know, into the water. All these frog men, it's a great underwater battle. Finally he rescue the bombs. And James Bond sails off into thecast with a beautiful girl.

4. ɑhn now hɑh Ikspleyn bət hɛr hɛzbɛn wɑz Iz ǰɛhw /
sow ə šiy wə trahn gIt hI hɛzbɛn ɑwt əv ǰɛhw /
hiy mɛt dIs blk ǰəǰ sow šiy ast In də gIt hI hɛzbɛn ɑwt If hiy kuhd yɛ now /
sow hiy wInt tuw ə miytɛn ɛn ney wɛ θiyɣkɛn cbɑwt də keys bɑwt wɛvə də mɑn šU biy lɛt ɑwt ə nɑt ahn pərow /
ɑn nɔ mIn wɛn ahn seyɛn næ dey down θiyɣk hiy šud blkɔz hiy dId ðIs ɔn hiy dId dɛt /
InɛI wey ðə əvə mɛn wɛn ɑwt /

I don't know how explain but her husband was in jail. So ahh she was trying get her husband out of fail. He met this big judge, so she asked him to get her husband out if he could, you know. So he went to a meeting and they were thinking about the case, 'bout wether the man should be let out or not on parole. And the men went on saying that they don't think he should, because he did this and he did that. Anyway, the other man won out.

5. sow ʌh wɐz swImIŋ at wIskʌnsɛn /
ændʌ sow ʌy gɛs ʌy sɔht ɔv rɐn ʌut ɔv ə stiym /
ʌy əz əfreyd yə now fɛrs tʌym ʌyd bIn In nə wɔtɛr In yIrz /
I wɐz əbʌwt tuw hɛndrɛd yʌrdz ɐn sow ʌh hæd swɐm əbʌwt ə hɛndrɛd
yʌrdz /
ænd sow ðɛn ʌy ʌh kʊdɛnt meyk It vɛrI wɛl /
æn ə It wɐz vɛrI hʌrd fɛr miy də kɐn bɐk IntɛI šɔhr /
ay hæd tə lʌy ɔn ðə plym fɛr əbʌwt ɐn ʌwɛr tə gɛt ɔhrgənayzd /

So I was swimming at Wisconsin. And ahh so I guess I sort of ran out of ahh steam. I was afraid you know first time I'd been in the water in years. It was about two hundred yards, and so I had swam about a hundred yards. And so then I, I couldn't make it very well. And ahh it was very hard for me to come back in to shore. I had to lie on the pier for about an hour to get organized.

6. gɔn wIθ ðə wIh dɛlt meynlI wɛθ ðIs mɐn noym ə rɛd bʊtlə ɐn ə
gɛrl skʌhlɛt owhɛrə /
æn šiy owɛz hæd ɔl ðə fɛlɛz bɛt š dɛh wɛz ðIs wɐn gay šiy
kʊdɐn gɛt/
æn šiy pʊt dahn ɔl ðə əðɐz fɛr hIm /
bɛt ə bə ðɛn ə rɛd bʊtlə wɐz fʊl ɔv ǰɛlɛsiy æn ǰɛs dIdɛn bɛliyv
Ir ɛniy mɔhr kɐz iy trahd hIs bɛs /
sow hiy wɔkt ʌut ɔn ə /

Gone With the Wind dealt mainly with this man name ahh Red Butler and a girl Scarlet O'Hara . And she always had all the fellas but sh', there was this

6. (continued)

one guy she couldn't get. And she put down all the others for him. But ahh by then ahh Red Butler was full of jealousy and just didn't believe her anymore 'cause he tried his best. So he walked out on her.

7. dæ wɝz ɔbɑwt yuw now ən yuw now fɔm nə biygInɨn ə man hæd gat kIhld/

ən ə sIdniy pohtIyey wɑz pʷɛsɨn θuw ðə tahn/

æn ney plkt hIm ɔp yuw now/

yɝ now hiy hæd ə howl lɑtə mɔnI æn θIrz bɔt hiy wɛz ə diytɑktIv hIz sɛlf/

bət ɛniywey yuw now æz də plčɝ gowz ɔn ɑn yɝ now čey fahn huw də kIlɝ wɛz æn yuw now æn ðIn θiyrz gIt tɑgɛdɝ æn ney riylI yɝ now stɑht lɑkIn iyč əðə ɛn It tɔrnd ɑwt prIvtiy gud yuw now/

That was about you know ahhm you know from the begining a man had got killed. And ahh Sidney Portier was passing through the town. And they picked him up, you know. You know he had a whole lot of money and things but he was a detective hisself. But anyway you know as the picture goes on, ahhm you know they found who the killer was and you know and then things get together and they really you know start liking each other and it turned out pretty good, you know.

8. ðah wɛz ɛlʷt ɛv ruwm fɝ kʷɔdiy ɨn čæt /

ah miyn yuw kɝn gɛt sow sIrIes čæt yuw kɝn biykɔn fəniy tuw yɔh vyuwɨɛ bət nɑt tuw ðə fʷčɝ hImsɛlf/

It wɛɛɨn fəniy tə hIm/

8. (continued)

ðɛt hiy wɛz sow sIrIɛs ɛbɛ̃ut ðiyiyŋ ðɛ̃nt ɛgɛ̃nst hIz sɛn mɛ̃riyŋ ðIs gɛ̃rl ðɛ̃t It gʊ̃t tuw ðə poInt ah miyn hiy hɛd ə riyl grʊ̃čiy lʊk ɔn hIz feys /

æn If yuw nɛvɛ̃ siyn ə mæn ɔ šowIn ðat mɛ̃č gpɛ̃zIšɛn frɔm ðiy ɛkspr ɛ̃šɛn ðə plkčɛ̃z wɛ̃rʊ wʊ̃yl siyIn /

There was a lot of room for comedy in that. I mean you can get so serious that you can become funny to your viewers but not to the father himself. It wasn't funny to him. But he was so serious about being bent against his marrying this girl that it got to the point, I mean he had a real grouchy look on his face. And if you never seen a man ahh showing that much opposition from the expression, the picture's worth while seeing.

9. ðə hah šɛ̃pɛ̃rɛl wɛ̃z ɛrIǰænlI ə IndIɛn lɛn /

ɛ̃n čə In ðə ɛpɛ̃čIn ə ɔweyz pʊlIn reydz ɔn nɛ̃m /

nɛh kʊ̃nsɛliy ə æ wɛh wIf ɛ̃m /

æn wɛn pɛtɛ̃lɛ̃ tahn ðIs ə IndIɛn čiyf neym mɛ̃krɛbɛl koym dawn /

æn ðey wɛ̃r treym də nɛgowšleyt ɔn sɛn tʊ̃yp ɛ piys tɛ̃rmz ðɛ̃t ə sɛn ə ɛbɛ̃ɛ̃ IndIɛnz dIn fiyl ðɛ̃t ə dIs ð rʊ̃yt wey /

sow dey ɛtImptɛ̃t tə ə kIl mɛ̃krɛdɛl lɛn ðleym It ɔn nə piypɛ̃t hah šɛ̃pɛ̃rɛl ðɛt ə dey ə dey wɛ̃rmt stɛshsfʊl /

The High Chaparell was originally a Indian land. And the, in the Apaches ahh always pulling raids on them. They're constantly ahh at war with them. And one particular time this ahh Indian chief name Pahabel came down. And they were trying to negotiate on some type of peace terms that ahh some of

9. (continued)

other Indians didn't feel that this the right way. So they attempted to ahh kill Makabel and blame it on the people at High Chaparell, but ahh they ahh they weren't successful.

10. ðɛr wɔz ə nuw prowgrɛm jʃs keym ɔn /
biykɔz ə ækšɛliy If yʊr riylI lʊk æt It I gʃhž yʊh ɛžckeyšən ɔn hɔw sən θiyvz mɔyt ɔpəreyt pɪk pɔkIts/
ɛn dIn də wey yuw now hah də kiyp ɔn lʊk ɔwt fə yɛsɛlf yɛ now /
wIn piypɛ bəmp In tɛ yɛ ə səmɔiyŋ æn yuw Is hɔnd tə bliyv sən ɔ ðə θiyɔz ðæt ɔn ðə gay duw Inə pIčɛr /
Its ə lɔt ə fIkšən In ɛt bIkɔz ɔn ah fIl Its fIkšən bIkɔz ɔn Is ImpɔsIbɛl fər sən piypɛl lə duw səmnə θiyɔz næ hiy duw ən gIt əwey wIhf It čuw now /

There was a new program just came on. Because ahh actually if you really look at it, it gives you education on how some thieves might opperate, pick pockets. And then that way you know how to keep on look out for yourself, you know. When people bump into you or something and you, it's hard to believe some of the things that ahm the guy do in the picture. It's a lot of fiction in it because ahm I feel it's fiction because ahhm it's impossible for some people to do some the things that he do nd get away with it, you know.

11. ðə stɔr šIhp hɛd də gow tuw ðIs ðIs sowlɛ sIstən ən kwayt ə fyuw plənɛts /
ɛn wIn ðey gɔt ðɛh ðey fawn ðæt ðɛh wənnt eniy lɔyf lɛft æt ɔl ɔn eniy ə ðə plənɛts /

11. (continued)

I wɨz ə I wɨz ə sʊtɜɪlɑʊyt ðɛt hæd ðɪn sɪnt ɑʊt mɪniy yɜrz ðiyfər /

æn wɛt It It wɨz spowzd tə trɑʊy tə fɑʊm nuw lɑʊyf /

ðɛt It hæd gʊtɪn čeynǰ sʊm hɑʊ ɪn nə sowlɪ stʊhm səmθiyŋ /

ðɛt It wɛz čeynǰd sow ðɛt ɪn stɛd əv trɑʊyn nə fɑʊyn nuw lɑʊyf

It had tə siyk ɑʊt də pərflk lɑʊyf /

The Star Ship had to go to this, this solar system and quite a few planets. And when they got there they found that there wasn't any life left at all on any of the planets. It was a, it was a satelite that had been sent out many years before. And what it it was sposed to try to find new life. But it had gotten change some how in the solar storm, something. But it was changed so that in stead of trying to find new life, it had to seek out the perfect life.

12. ðə məǰɑʊrɪtɪ dɪsɑʊɜd huw wɜz tʊ huwz gonə kɑʊnt /

ɜn dɪn ə dɪn səmbʊdɪ ɛs kol tɪn kɑʊnt tə tɪn /

dɪn wiy gow ɑʊt ɜn fahn huw ɛvɜ wiy fɑʊm

fɜrs wɛz ɪt/

ðɪn ɛvrɒadɪ wɜz hiy towl ɛvrɪbʊdɪ huw wɜz huw hiy tæg /

ðɪn frɛm nɪn ɔn It kahnə rowteytɪ huw ɛvə hiy kɛht/

y k yuw kʊd kɜč ə mɜn mɜnɪ tahmz oh də seym pɜrsɜn /

nɪwey dɛs də wey də geym wʊ gow/

The majority decided who was to, who's going to count. And then somebody just call ten count to ten. The we go out and find who ever we found first was it. Then everybody was, he told everybody who was, who he tag. Then from then on, it kind of rotated whoever he caught. Y' c', you could catch a man many times or the same person. Anyway that's the way the game would go.

13. bɑ̈nI ən klahd wəz əbɑ̈ut dIs ən yəŋ mæn ænd ðIs yəŋ wUmɛ̃n /
ən ney wɛ̃ wInt stɑ̈n rɑ̈bIm bæŋks ɔw dUɛ̃n nə plǎ̈ɛ̃ /
ænnə powliys wəz ɑweyz hɑ̈ ən ɛ̃m bət klahd hiy dIdn wɑ̈mə rIyll
klh now bædI jǎ̈ɛs kll wIn niy hæd də kIl /
ən ən at dI ən wɛ̃n ney gɑ̈t šɑ̈t ɔp prɛ̃tI bæ powliys dey jǎ̈ɛs
owpɛ̃n ɔp ɔn nɑ̈n yuw now fahd mǎ̈iyn gænz /
jǎ̈ɛs šɑ̈t ən ɔl ɔp /

Bonnie and Clyde was about this ahhm young man and this young woman. And they were, went, start robbing banks all during the picture. And the police was always hot on them but Clyde he didn't want to really kill nobody just dill when he had to kill. And ahhm, at the end when they got shot up pretty bad, police they just open up on them, you know, fired machine guns. Just shot them all up.

14. sow wət hiy dɛ̃n hiy tUk də əgliy hiy wIpt ɛ̃m ɛ̃n meyd ɛ̃m tɛl huw now əbɑ̈rt It /
sow dæt ownlI liyv də gUt/
hiy dIdn duw næ̃ɛ̃n əbɑ̈wt It /
sow æftɛ̃ hiy dæg ə æftɛ̃ də əglI dæg ɔp dI mənI də gUd gah
pUt ə rowp ərahn hIz næk ɛ̃n stɛ̃n ɛ̃m ɔp ɔn ə ɔn ɔn wɛ̃n ə ɛ̃ɛ̃
krɔsɛ̃z ɛ̃n stUd ɛ̃m ɔp ɔn næt wIt ə rowp rɑ̈wm hIz næk ɔp hæɛ̃n
frɛ̃m ə triy /
æn hiy rowd ɔf ə kɛ̃pɛ̃l ahl sey fyuw fiyt əwey frɛ̃m ɛ̃m dɛ̃n iy
šɑ̈t ɛ̃m dahn æn rowd ɔn /

14. So what he, then he took the"Ugly",he whipped him, and made him tell who know about it. So that only leave the"Good". He didn't do nothing about it. So after he dug a, after the"Ugly"dug up the money, the good guy put a rope around his neck and stand him up on a, on, on one of the crosses, and stood him up on that with a rope round his neck up hanging from a tree. And he rode off a couple, I'll say few feet away from him, then he shot him down and rode on.

15. ðɛh wəz ə mɪn nɛ hiy ɨd ə sɨvd tahm In ǰɛh /
ən hiy kɛn tə ðɪs ən pɛtɪklə fɛhm tə əplah fɨ ə ǰʊw /
hiy ə ow mənɪǰ tə gɪt də ǰʊw /
sɛm mən sɛm ɛðə frɛnd ə hɨz rɛkənɛyz hɪm siy /
ah miyn sɛmwən hɛd towl dɛt hiy wəz In nɪs tɛwn /
ən ə eniy hɛw ðə ðɪ hɛd mɪn wʊdɨn lɛt hɪm gow /
hiy wʊdɨn lɛw ðə šɨrɨf teyk ɨm bɛk tʊ ǰɛhl siy /
sɛd hiyd biy hiyd teyk rɪspɛnsɨbɪlɛtɪ /

There was a man that he had to serve time in jail. And he come to this ahhn particular farm to apply for a jow. He ahh oh, manage to get the jow. Some man, some other friend of his recognize him, see.
I mean someone had told that he was in this town. And ahh anyhow, the the head man wouldn't let him go. He wouldn't allow the sherriff take him back to jail, see. Said he'd be, he'd take responsibility.

16. wɐz ə ɒlk dʊw hwy now kəɹɑtI /

æn dIs gæŋstɨ hol ǰeym ɒn tʊwɨ ɔfIs /

æn ǰeym ɒn keym də ɔfIs æn dIn hiy sɛn ǰeym ɒn ɔn ə

mIšɨn /

æn dIn ǰeym ɒn ə hiy went In nIs ɒwt /

æn dɛn hiy dɑyd ɔt də ɒwt /

æn dIn hiy went ɛndɨ də ə wɔtɨ /

æn æn hiy æ wInt In nIs tɛnɨl /

æn dIn ə ə ɒlk ǰɑnt spɛndɨ keym æt ǰeym ɒn /

æn dIn ǰeym ɒn hɛd I wɑč ɔn I ɑm /

æn hiy pʊš sʌmθɨŋ ɔnə ɛniyf ɨ wɑč /

æn ə ɒlɨt keym ɑwt æn šɑt də mɔnstə /

Was a ɒig dude who know karate. And this gangster call James Bond to his office. And James Bond came (to) the office and then he sent James Bond on a mission. And then James Bond ahh he went in this ɒoat. And then he dived out the ɒoat. And then he went under the ahh water. And and he ahh went in this tunnel. And then a, a ɒig giant spider came at James Bond. And then James Bond had his watch on his arm. And he push something or 'nother underneaf his watch. And a ɒullet came out and shot the monster.

6.3 Appendix
Study A Questionnaire

PART I

Sample: a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

awkward ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ graceful

relaxed ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ tense

formal ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ informal

thin ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ thick

correct ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ incorrect

1. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (X) 4 ( )

   c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

   SAMPLE

   correct ___: ___: ___: ___: X: ___: ___ incorrect

   awkward ___: ___: X: ___: ___: ___: ___ graceful

   relaxed ___: X: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ tense

   formal ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: X: ___ informal

   thin ___: ___: ___: ___: X: ___: ___ thick

2. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 (X)

   c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

   incorrect X: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ correct

   graceful ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: X awkward

   tense ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: X relaxed

   informal X: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ formal

   thick X: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ thin

3. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1 (X) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

   c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

   incorrect ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: X correct

   thick ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: X thin

   informal ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: X formal

   tense ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: X relaxed

   graceful ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: X awkward

4. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White (X)

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 (X) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

awkward ___:___:___:___:___:X:___ graceful

relaxed ___:___:___:___:___:X:X tense

formal ___:X:___:___:___:___:___ informal

thin ___:X:___:___:___:___:___ thick

correct ___:X:___:___:___:___:___ ~~informal~~ incorrect

5. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (X) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

relaxed ___:___:X:___:___:___:___ tense

thick ___:___:X:___:___:___:___ thin

correct ___:___:___:___:X:X:___ incorrect

informal ___:___:X:___:___:___:___ formal

graceful ___:___:___:___:X:___:___ awkward

6. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White (X)

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (X) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

correct ___:___:___:___:X:___:___ incorrect

awkward ___:___:X:___:___:___:___ graceful

relaxed ___:___:X:___:___:___:___ tense

formal ___:___:___:___:X:___:___ informal

thin ___:___:___:___:X:___:___ thick

7. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (X) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

incorrect	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	correct
graceful	___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___	awkward
tense	___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___	relaxed
informal	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	formal
thick	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	thin

8. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White (X)

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (X) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

incorrect	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	correct
thick	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	thin
informal	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	formal
tense	___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___	relaxed
graceful	___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___	awkward

9. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White (X)

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 (X) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

awkward	___:___:___:___:___:___:_X_	graceful
relaxed	___:___:___:___:___:___:_X_	tense
formal	_X_:___:___:___:___:___:___	informal
thin	_X_:___:___:___:___:___:___	thick
correct	_X_:___:___:___:___:___:___	incorrect

10. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White (X)

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (X) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

relaxed ___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___ tense

thick ___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___ thin

correct ___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___ incorrect

informal ___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___ formal

graceful ___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___ awkward

11. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 (X) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

correct _X_:___:___:___:___:___:___ incorrect

awkward ___:___:___:___:___:___:_X_ graceful

relaxed ___:___:___:___:___:___:_X_ tense

formal _X_:___:___:___:___:___:___ informal

thin _X_:___:___:___:___:___:___ thick

12. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 (X) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

incorrect ___:___:___:___:___:_X_:___ correct

graceful ___:_X_:___:___:___:___:___ awkward

tense ___:_X_:___:___:___:___:___ relaxed

informal ___:___:___:___:___:_X_:___ formal

thick ___:___:___:___:___:_X_:___ thin

13. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 (X)

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

incorrect	X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	correct
thick	X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	thin
informal	X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	formal
tense	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X	relaxed
graceful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X	awkward

14. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 (X) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

awkward	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X : ___	graceful
relaxed	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X : ___	tense
formal	___ : ___ : X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	informal
thin	___ : ___ : X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	thick
correct	___ : X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	incorrect

15. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 (X) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

thick	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X : ___	thin
correct	___ : X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	incorrect
informal	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X : ___	formal
graceful	___ : X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	awkward
relaxed	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X : ___	tense

16. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (X) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

correct ___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___ incorrect

awkward ___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___ graceful

relaxed ___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___ tense

formal ___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___ informal

thin ___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___ thick

17. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White (X)

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 (X) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

incorrect ___:___:___:___:___:___:_X_ correct

graceful ___:_X_:___:___:___:___:___ awkward

tense ___:_X_:___:___:___:___:___ relaxed

informal ___:___:___:___:___:_X_:___ formal

thick ___:___:___:___:___:_X_:___ thin

18. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 (X) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

incorrect ___:___:___:___:___:_X_:___ correct

thick ___:___:___:___:___:_X_:___ thin

informal ___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___ formal

tense ___:___:___:___:___:_X_:___ relaxed

graceful ___:___:___:_X_:_X_:___:___ awkward

19. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White (X)

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 (X)

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

awkward X : : : : : : graceful

relaxed X : : : : : : tense

formal : : : : : : X informal

thin : : : : : : X thick

correct : : : : : : X incorrect

20. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White (X)

b) What is the educational/ occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (X) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

relaxed : : X : : : : tense

thick : : : X : : : thin

correct : : X : : : : incorrect

informal : : X : : : : formal

graceful : : : X : : : awkward

21. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 (X) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

correct X : : : : : : incorrect

awkward : : : : : : X graceful

relaxed : : : : : : X tense

formal X : : : : : : informal

thin X : : : : : : thick

22. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 (X)

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

incorrect X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ correct

graceful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X awkward

tense ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X relaxed

informal X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ formal

thick X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ thin

23. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White (X)

b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (X) 4 ( )

c) Rate the speech sample on each of the following scales:

incorrect ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X : ___ : ___ correct

thick ___ : ___ : X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ thin

informal ___ : ___ : X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ formal

tense ___ : ___ : X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ relaxed

graceful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X : ___ : ___ awkward

1. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1( ) 2( ) 3(X) 4( )

2. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White (X)

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1 ( ) 2( ) 3(X) 4( )

3. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3(X) 4( )

4. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1 ( ) 2(X) 3( ) 4( )

5. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White (X)

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1 ( ) 2( ) 3(X) 4( )

6. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1 (X) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

7. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (X) 4 ( )

8. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (X) 4 ( )

9. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro (X) White ( )

   b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

   1 ( ) 2 (X) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

10. a) What is the race of this speaker? Negro ( ) White (X)

    b) What is the educational/occupational level of this speaker?

    1 (X) 2 (X) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

1. DIALECT

good	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	bad
thin	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	thick
careful	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	sloppy
rough	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	smooth
positive	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	negative
difficult	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	easy
dull	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	sharp
smart	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	dumb
weak	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	strong
fast	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	slow
complex	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	simple
worthless	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	valuable

2. WHITE SOUTHERN SPEECH

dull	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	sharp
smart	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	dumb
weak	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	strong
fast	___:___:___:___:___:_X_:___	slow
complex	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	simple
worthless	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	valuable
good	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	bad
thin	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	thick
careful	___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___	sloppy
rough	___:___:___:___:___:___:_X_	smooth
positive	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	negative
difficult	___:___:___:___:___:___:_X_	easy

3. ERITISH SPEECH

bad	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	good
thick	X:___:___:___:___:___:___	thin
sloppy	___:___:___:___:___:___:X	careful
smooth	X:___:___:___:___:___:___	rough
negative	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	positive
easy	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	difficult
sharp	___:___:___:___:X:___:___	dull
dumb	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	smart
strong	___:X:___:___:___:___:___	weak
slow	___:___:X:___:___:___:___	fast
simple	___:___:___:___:X:___:___	complex
valuable	___:___:___:___:X:___:___	worthless

4. WASHINGTON SPEECH

slow	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	fast
simple	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	complex
valuable	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	worthless
bad	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	good
thick	___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___	thin
sloppy	___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___	careful
smooth	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	rough
negative	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	positive
easy	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	difficult
sharp	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	dull
dumb	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	smart
strong	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	weak

5. NEGRO SPEECH

worthless	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	valuable
dull	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	sharp
difficult	___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___	easy
positive	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	negative
rough	___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___	smooth
weak	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	strong
fast	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	slow
sloppy	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	careful
complex	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	simple
thick	___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___	thin
bad	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	good
smart	___:___:___:_X_:___:___:___	dumb

6. STANDARD SPEECH

complex	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	simple
thin	___:___:X:___:___:___:___	thick
fast	___:___:___:___:X:___:___	slow
sloppy	___:___:___:___:___:___:X	careful
strong	X:___:___:___:___:___:___	weak
smooth	X:___:___:___:___:___:___	rough
dumb	___:___:___:___:___:X:___	smart
positive	___:X:___:___:___:___:___	negative
good	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	bad
dull	___:___:___:___:___:X:___	sharp
valuable	___:___:___:X:___:___:___	worthless
difficult	___:___:___:___:___:X:___	easy

PERSONAL INFORMATION

(For Statistical Purposes Only)

1. Sex: Male ☐ Female ☒

2. Age: 24

3. Occupation of head of household: Student - Washington Grad Inst.

4. Education of head of household:

Elementary and High School	College and Graduate School
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 (12)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (8)

5. Address: 20 - Fourth Street, SE DC 20003.

6. How long have you lived in Washington? 7 6/12 years.

Born. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

6.4 Appendix D
Study B Questionnaire

EMPLOYER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Job Title: ----------

2. Total number of employees: ----------

3. Percentage of employees in public contact (either directly or by telephone) ---------

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

July 1968

1. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what positions in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

2. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) NO

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what positions in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

3. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what position in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

4. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what positions in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

5. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what positions in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

6. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what positions in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

7. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what positions in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

8. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what position in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

9. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what positions in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

10. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what positions in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

11. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what positions in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

12. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what position in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

13. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what position in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

14. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what positions in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

15. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what position in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

16. a) On the basis of the speech sample, do you consider this person employable?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b) If yes, assuming he meets other qualifications, what position in your organization would be available to him, given his speech pattern?

1. ----------

2. ----------

3. ----------

17. In selecting an employee, to what extent are you influenced by his speech?

6.4 Appendix J

Study B Questionnaire

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age:_____

2. Grade:_____

3. Do you plan to go to college?_____

4. What kind of job would you like to have in the next few years?_____

_____

Center For Applied Linguistics
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

November 1968

1. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug Store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchmen

2. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Sales supervisor	☐ Salesman
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

3. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

4. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

5. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

6. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

7. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no
   b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no
   c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none
   d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

8. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no
   b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no
   c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none
   d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

9. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no
   b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no
   c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none
   d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

10. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

11. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

12. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

13. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

14. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountain	☐ Night watchman

15. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman

16. a) Does this person sound successful? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) Is his speech acceptable (to you)? ☐ yes ☐ no

c) Do your friends talk like he does? ☐ all ☐ some ☐ none

d) Which of the following jobs do you think he might have? (Check one or more)

☐ Laborer	☐ Janitor	☐ Newspaper reporter
☐ College professor	☐ Salesman	☐ Sales supervisor
☐ Key punch operator	☐ Doctor	☐ Fire chief
☐ Truck driver	☐ Printer	☐ Policeman
☐ Junior manager	☐ Bus-boy	☐ Drug store owner
☐ Mechanic	☐ Gas station attendant	☐ Stock clerk
☐ Architect	☐ Accountant	☐ Night watchman